









THE  
TAITTIRĪYA-PRĀTISĀKHYA

*With its Commentary the Tribhāshyaratna : Text,  
Translation and Notes*

WILLIAM D. WHITNEY

MOTILAL BANARSIDASS

DELHI :: PATNA :: VARANASI

**©MOTILAL BANARSIDASS**

Head Office : BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7

Branches : 1. CHOWK, VARANASI (U.P.)

2. ASHOK RAJPATH (OPP. PATNA COLLEGE ),  
PATNA-4 (BIHAR)

First Edition : New Haven, 1868

**2001**  
Reprint : Delhi, 1973

**Price: Rs. 40.00**

Printed in India

BY SHANTILAL JAIN, AT SHRI JAINENDRA PRESS, BUNGALOW ROAD,  
JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7 AND PUBLISHED BY SUNDARLAL JAIN FOR  
MOTILAL BANARSIDASS, BUNGALOW ROAD, JAWAHARNAGAR, DELHI-7

## ARTICLE I.

# THE TÂITTIRÎYA-PRÂTICÂKHYA,

WITH ITS COMMENTARY,

## THE TRIBHÂSHYARATNA:

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES.

BY WILLIAM D. WHITNEY,

PROFESSOR OF SANSKRIT IN YALE COLLEGE.

Presented to the Society October 14th, 1868.

### INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

THE manuscript material on which is founded this edition of the Tâittirîya-Prâtîcâkhyâ and Tribhâshyâratna is as follows:

1. T. A copy of the text of the treatise alone, in a modern hand, on light-colored paper. It was sent me by Prof. Fitz-Edward Hall, from Benares, in 1857, and appears to be a copy made for him from some older manuscript: but it contains no intimation of its own date or of that of its original; presenting at the end, in place of the usual colophon, the beginning of a list of words which in *pada*-text show a final *n*. It is distinctly and correctly written. On the back is inscribed "Kṛishṇa-yajuh-prâtisâkhyâ, by Kârtikeya." On what ground this ascription of authorship is made, I do not know; it does not, so far as I am aware, find support from any other quarter.

2. W. A copy of the text and commentary together, each separate rule being followed by its own comment. This manuscript, like the preceding, I owe to the kindness of Prof. Hall. It is handsomely written, in a large clear hand, and fills 146 leaves (numbered 1-89, 100, 1-56), measuring about four and a half by nine and a half inches. To the end of 25a, seven lines are written on a page; thenceforward, nine lines. It has no statement of scribe, place, or date; but I imagine that a final leaf, with the end of the colophon, had been lost or destroyed some time before it was sent to me. The part remaining reads as follows: *çrikrshnâr-pabhastu çrikâlabhâiravaprasann om yâyakâṁḍavidhâyardhvam ṛshayo ṛshayo ṛshih: ity âçisraçîmalâpârvam ṛsham ce ti svatam-tratâ: 1 kramyâdhvano bhavaty agre pâvako rpayatiti ca*. This just fills up the leaf; but another hand has written below, at its edge, what purports to be the ending of the second verse: *vishâ-*

*yemgira ity evāpy agra ity ādi lupyate.*2., and has added. as final benediction, *grīvigeṅgaraprasann.*

This is a virgin manuscript, containing neither erasures, insertions, nor alterations. Considering that it thus presents every first fault of its scribe unamended, it is very good and correct. Through the first twelve chapters, the rules of the *Prātiçākhyā* are distinguished from the commentary by being rubbed over with a red powder.

3. **B.** This authority comes from the west of India, where (see Dr. Bühler, in *Zeitsch. Deut. Morg. Ges.*, xii.319) the *Tribhāshyaratna* is said to be not very rare. From a manuscript there collected, a copy was made under direction of Dr. Bühler for the Berlin library, and forwarded to Prof. Weber, at whose friendly suggestion and instance it was transcribed for me, in roman letters, by Dr. Siegfried Goldschmidt, to whom I desire here to express my gratitude for a service so valuable and so kindly rendered. The manuscript contains more inaccuracies of reading than any of the others which I have used, yet they are in the main superficial, and the text given is a pretty complete and correct one.

4. **O.** Through the kind offices of Prof. Max Müller, I have been enabled to procure a collation (made with a copy of my own manuscript, "W.") of the incomplete Oxford manuscript (MS. Bodl. W. 478), first described by Roth (*Zur Lit. und Gesch. des Weda*, pp. 54, 62 seq.), and used also by Weber (*Ind. Stud.* iv.77 seq.). It begins in the middle of the comment upon iii.12, thus lacking somewhat less than a quarter of the entire work.

5. **G.** This is a romanized copy of a manuscript which belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, and is written on strips of palm leaf, in the Grantham character. The copy was made for me by Dr. Julius Eggeling, who has thus laid me under deep obligation, and contributed most essentially to the success of my work. Hardly less than to him is my indebtedness to Dr. Reinhold Rost, Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, who notified me of the existence of the manuscripts in the Society's library soon after their discovery, and who suggested and aided their transcription. There are doubtless few other Sanskritists in Europe, besides these gentlemen, to whom works written in the southern Indian characters are not sealed books, and there can be none, I am sure, who evince a more liberal readiness to make their peculiar knowledge of service to the rest. The catalogue which Dr. Rost is preparing to publish of the Royal Asiatic Society's collection of manuscripts will give such other particulars respecting age, condition, etc., as I am compelled here to omit.

6. **M.** The library of the same Society also contains a second copy of the *Prātiçākhyā* and its commentary, written on paper, in the Malayālam character. Of this, Dr. Eggeling has taken the pains to note the various readings as compared with the Grantham manuscript, in his transcript of the latter.

Both these manuscripts from southern India are so arranged

that the rules of the *Prātiśākhya* are given first, in a body, and are followed by the commentary, also in bulk

As regards the text of the *Prātiśākhya* itself, all these authorities agree very closely: there are but two or three cases of well-established variations of reading among them. In respect to the text of the commentary, their accordance, as was to be expected, is much less: they fall, in fact, into three well-marked classes; or, as one might say, present three different recensions of the work. The two codices belonging to the Royal Asiatic Society, the Grantham ("G.") and the Malayalam ("M."), stand in the nearest possible relation to one another, having almost all their errors, omissions, and orthographical peculiarities in common, and only by comparatively rare and inconspicuous differences proved not to be copied the one from the other. My own manuscript ("W.") and that sent by Dr. Bühler from Bombay ("B.") also offer substantially the same text, although their differences are much more frequent, and of a more important character, than those of G. and M. As for the Oxford manuscript ("O."), it is, in its earlier portions, pretty closely accordant with W. and B., having an especially near relationship to B., with whose slight variations of the text given by W. it almost uniformly agrees; later, however, it strikes off upon a track of its own, and comes to differ from both the other recensions in a much greater degree than they differ between themselves.

Such being the case, I have thought it best to adopt for publication the version offered by W., partly because this is the only one for which I possess an original manuscript (and a tolerably old and correct one), partly because it is, upon the whole, better supported than that of G. and M.—which, as I have shown above, can hardly be reckoned, both together, as constituting more than a single manuscript. I have accordingly, avoiding the making up of an eclectic text from the various recensions, followed W. as closely as I could; and especially, when it was supported by the joint authority of B. and O., or of B. alone—thus sometimes, undoubtedly, rejecting an intrinsically preferable and perhaps more original reading given by one or another of the remaining authorities, if that offered by W. was of a character to be endured. At the end of the comment to each rule are given the various readings of all the manuscripts, with sufficient fullness, I hope, to answer the desirable ends of critical comparison. Obvious and trifling errors of transcription, of course, I have not noted, but only those which made a false reading or tended to become such: I have been most liberal in overlooking the blunders of B., as being, on the whole, of least consequence.

In regard, however, to the two matters of punctuation and euphonic combination, I have taken liberties with the text of which I have given no account. The various manuscripts are in no slight degree discordant with one another, inconsistent with themselves, and careless of the requirements of the sense, in the use they make of the signs of interpunction: they offer absolutely

no standard to follow. For the occurrence of the signs as printed, therefore, I am alone responsible; and no one who can anywhere make a better division of clauses than I have made need be restrained from so doing by the belief that he is running counter to manuscript authority. Again, I have (except in certain cases at the end of a cited rule or passage, where a reference follows) put all the words of the commentary in euphonic combination according to the usual rules; while in the manuscripts (as is common in exegetical writings) they are very frequently, for the sake of greater clearness, separated from one another.\* Here, too, the usage of the various authorities is too discordant and irregular to be followed. And to report their readings in these two particulars would burden the critical notes with a mass of useless and wearisome details.

In the same manner are treated such orthographical peculiarities of the several manuscripts as that G. and M. regularly write a final sibilant instead of *visarjanīya* before an initial sibilant, and often, where a *m* is assimilated to a following mute, write the nasal mute corresponding to the latter, instead of *anusvāra*. Moreover, in the representation of the nasal sounds, by the nasal consonants, *anusvāra* (ñ), or *m*, I have followed a consistent method, with disregard of the manuscript usage.

The text given at the foot of the page contains the whole comment, with two exceptions: citations from the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, being written out in full, with references, in the notes to the rules, are indicated below only by first words or letters, with signs of omission added; and again, where lists of affected words are given in a rule, in euphonic combination, and repeated, separate, at the beginning of the comment, they are replaced by signs of omission, as having been sufficiently presented uncombined in the translation of the rule. Errors of reading in the cited passages themselves are passed without notice, unless of such importance as to cast doubt upon the identity of the passage; but, on the other hand, the frequent differences of the versions as regards the extent of the illustrative passage cited are fully noted in the sequel of the reference.

I have preferred, instead of giving an express and direct translation of the commentary, to work its substance fully into my own notes upon the rules, somewhat as in my edition of the Atharva Prātiçākhyā (Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, Vol. vii., 1862). The different conditions of the case, however, impress quite a different character upon the present work. The completeness and elaborateness of the Tribhāṣyaratna make its working-up by far the larger and more important part of what is to be done in illustration of the Prātiçākhyā. Possessing no *index verborum* to the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, nor even a manuscript of its *pada*-text, I have not been able to try the Prātiçākhyā by it with anything like the same

\* Thus, to instance an extreme case, at the end of the comment on iv.10, the manuscripts read (for once, with almost perfect unanimity): *īṅgyasya antaḥ īṅgyāntaḥ na īṅgyāntaḥ aniṅgyāntaḥ*.

thoroughness as in the case of the similar treatise to the Atharvan. What could be done in the way of testing and supplementing the rules given, by a careful reading and excerption of the *Sanhitā* in a single good *sanhitā*-manuscript (also procured for me in India by Dr. Hall, and with one or two slight deficiencies in it made up from Berlin, by Prof. Weber), I have endeavored to do. I have been able to refer points of interest connected with the text, in its *sanhitā* or *padu* readings, to friends in Europe owning or having access to fuller manuscript material, namely to Professors Weber of Berlin and Haug of München, and have received from them important aid, which I desire here gratefully to acknowledge. Of references to the teachings of the other *Prātiśākhya*s I have been much more sparing in this than in the former work, in order to avoid repetition: and, for the same reason, some matters of theory which were pretty fully discussed there receive here a more compendious treatment. The present work, in short, to a certain extent presupposes the other—not, however, in such a manner or degree as should interfere with its independence and separate intelligibility.

In making reference to the *Tāittirīya-Sanhitā*, I have used only three principal numbers, to designate book, chapter, and section, or *kāṇḍa*, *pragṇa*, and *anuvāka*. The further division of the sections or *anuvākas*, where they are of more considerable length, into parcels of fifty words each, is so artificial, destructive of the natural connection of passages, detrimental to the proper phonetic form of the text, and wholly ignored by the *Prātiśākhya* (see notes to the rules of chapter iii.), that I have preferred to express it by the use of “superior” figures attached to that which indicates the *anuvāka*. Of course, where such attached figure is wanting, the *anuvāka* is to be understood as composed of a single division.

In the notes of various readings, each figure refers only to the single word to which it is attached, unless a passage of more than one word is included between two repetitions of the same figure; in which case the reference figure, in the notes, is put within parentheses. The abbreviation “om.” means ‘omit,’ and “ins.” means ‘insert.’

In all transliterated passages of Sanskrit, a colon stands in place of a single stroke of interpunction, and a full stop in place of a double stroke. The general method of transliteration is the same with that which I have hitherto used in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*; it will be sufficiently understood from the alphabet given in the note to i.1 (p. 10).



## CHAPTER I.

CONTENTS: 1-11, enumeration and classification of sounds composing the alphabet; 12-14, surd and sonant consonants; 15, list of prepositions; 16-21, 27, names of letters and classes of letters; 22-24, 28, terminology of cited words, etc.; 25, 26, 29, 30, respecting the interpretation of rules; 31-37, quantity of simple sounds; 38-40, the three accents; 41-47, details respecting the circumflex accent; 48, 49, compound words; 50-53, respecting cited words; 54-55, words consisting of a single vowel; 56-61, further specifications respecting the interpretation of rules.

THE commentator begins his work with a couple of rather awkwardly-constructed verses, as follows: "I, bowing low with devoted affection to the two feet of Gaṇeśa, as also to the *gurus* and to divine Voice, shall proceed to utter this comment; which, made upon examination of the exposition of the Prātiśākhya given by Vararuci etc., shines, a Treasure of Threefold Comment (*tribhāshyaratna*), approved of Brahmans." He adds an exposition of their meaning, explaining *giram devīm*, 'divine Voice,' by *vāgdevīm*, 'Goddess of Voice,' and *bhāsura*, 'Brahman' (literally 'earth-god'), by *vidvat*, 'learned man, sage.' On *lakṣhaṇa*, which, as name of a comment, is least in accordance

'bhaktiyuktaḥ pranamyā 'haṁ gaṇeśacaranadvayam:

gurān api giram<sup>2</sup> devīm idam vakshyāmi lakṣhaṇam.<sup>1</sup>

vyākhyānam prātiśākhyasya vikshya vārarucādikam<sup>3</sup>:

kṛtaṁ tribhāshyaratnam yad bhāsate bhāsurapriyam.<sup>2</sup>

*ślokeyor anayor ayaṁ<sup>4</sup> arthaḥ. bhaktiyukto 'haṁ gaṇeśacaranadvayam gurān giram<sup>5</sup> api devīm: 'vāgdevīm ity arthaḥ: tām ca<sup>6</sup> pranamyā lakṣhaṇam idam vakshyāmi ya<sup>7</sup> lakṣhaṇam tribhāshyaratnandamakam bhāsurapriyam vidvatpriyam bhāsate: kīdrcaṁ lakṣhaṇam: prātiśākhyasya vyākhyānarūpakam<sup>8</sup> vārarucādikam<sup>9</sup> bhāshyājātaṁ vikshya<sup>10</sup> nyūnatirekaparihāreṇa kṛtaṁ viracitam: ādiṣabdenā<sup>11</sup> 'treyaṁdhisheyāu gṛhyete: ata eva tribhāshyaratnam iti nāmna upapattiḥ: trayāṇāṁ bhāshyāṇāṁ samāhāras tribhāshyam: tasya<sup>12</sup> ratnam bhāṣhaṇam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. prefaces with *ṣṛigaṇeśāya namaḥ. ṣṛigaṇeśa prasanno 'stu. om.* B. prefaces with *ṣṛigaṇeśāya namaḥ. ṣṛisarasvatyāi namaḥ. ṣṛidātānmayāya namaḥ:* and the additional verse

*śuklimbaradharaṁ devaṁ ṣaṣṭivarnam caturbhujam:*

*prasannavadanam dhyāyet sarvaviṣṇoparāntaye.1.*

'The white-vestment-bearing god, moon-hued, four-armed, propitious-faced, must one meditate on, in order to the surcease of all disturbance.' It then numbers the other verses "2" and "3;" but proceeds to confess the unguineness of the inserted verse by reading, like the other MSS., *anayoḥ ślokeyoḥ*.

<sup>2</sup> G. M. *giram*. <sup>3</sup> B. *var.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *giram*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>7</sup> G. M. *tal.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. *-rūpam*; B. *-pūrvakam*. <sup>9</sup> B. *var.*; W. *-ka*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *samikshya*.

<sup>11</sup> W. *om.*

with common usage, he makes no remark. To *vikshya*, 'having examined,' he adds *nyūnātirekaparihārena*, 'with avoidance of deficiency and redundancy.' The "etc." after "Vararuci" is declared to refer to Ātreya and Māhisheya, these three being the authorities upon which the present work is founded, and from which it derives its name. Vararuci and Māhisheya are, indeed, often (about ten times each: see Index) referred to in the sequel, and their discordant views sometimes set forth and discussed: Ātreya has only once (under v.1) the honor of being mentioned. Who is the digester of their three works, and author of the present commentary, which has taken their place and crowded them out of existence, we are not informed; nor, so far as I am aware, has any evidence bearing upon the point been anywhere brought to knowledge. Notice of the different authorities cited by our commentator will be put together in an additional note at the end of this work, for the sake of the light cast by them upon his age.

## अथ वणसिमान्नायः ॥ १ ॥

### I. Now the list of sounds.

The commentator first gives himself a great deal of trouble to explain the meaning of *atha*, 'now,' in the rule. He quotes Amara's definition of *atho* and *atha* (Amarakosha iii.4.32.8; p. 349 of Deslongchamps's edition), and points out that, as a variety of meanings is there attributed to *atha*, it is necessary to fix upon a single meaning for it here. In the first place, then, a propitiatory significance is claimed for it, by reason of its equivalence with *om*; "since the Çikshā-makers declare, '*om* and *atha* are deemed propitiatory.'" Or, again, it indicates something coming next after another; "the implication being that, next after the reading of the Veda, one should gain a knowledge of the *lakshana*: there hav-

1. *maṅgalānantarārambhapraçnakārtsnyeshv atho athe 'ti maṅgalādyanekārthatvād athaçabdasya 'rthanirṇayārtham eko 'rtho' niçcetavyaḥ: tatra prathamam tāvan maṅgalārthatvam ucyate: tasya prapañcasādharmyāt: tathā hi samācakshate çikshākārāḥ:*

*omkāraḥ ca 'tṇaçabdaḥ ca maṅgalān iti kīrtitān iti: āho' svid ānantaryārthatā: vedādhyayanānantaram lakṣaṇajñānam kuryād iti sāpekṣatvād lakṣaṇasya pūrvam vedādhi- game saty atha lakṣaṇaparikṣhāvasaraḥ: atha vā 'dhikārārtho 'tṇaçabdaḥ: tv athai 've 'ti vinivartakādhikāraḥ āva- dhārakāḥ (xxii.6) iti vidyamānatvāt: atha varṇasamāmnāyaḥ pāṭhakramo' 'dhikriyata iti sūtrānvayaḥ: sam ity ekibhāve: ān iti maryādāyam: mnāya ity ānupūrvyeno 'padeçāḥ: ekibhātā akārādāyo varṇāḥ svarabhaktiparyavasānā ānupūrvyena pūrvaiḥ pishṭāir' upadiṣṭāḥ.*

ing been study of the Veda before the *lakshana*, now comes the occasion for the investigation of the *lakshana*." Here, *lakshana* appears to be used to designate the Prâtigâkhyâ itself, as above it denoted the commentary to the latter. Once more, *atha* is declared to have the force of an introduction or heading, according to rule xxii.6, below: "*tu, atha, and eva* are respectively exceptive, introductory, and limitative;" and the connection of the rule is that *now* the list of sounds, the order of reading (*pâthakrama*), is made the subject of treatment.

The composition of *samâmnâya*, 'list, rehearsal,' is next pointed out, and the word is stated to mean "the collective sounds, beginning with *a* and ending with the *svarabhakti*, in their order, as taught by former learned men."

The catalogue itself follows, as understood by the commentator to be taught or implied in the rules of the treatise. First come the vowels, of which only sixteen are reckoned (see rule 5, below): *a, i, and u* have each a short, a long, and a protracted value, *r* only a short and a long, *l* only a short (W. and B. take the pains to write a figure 2 after the long *r*, and a 1 after the *l*, to point out clearly the number of *moras* they respectively contain; and B. adds after the *âi* and *âu* a 2, for the same purpose); second, the twenty-five mutes (see rule 7); third, the four semivowels (rule 8); and fourth, the six spirants (rule 9). This makes fifty-one sounds, clearly specified and counted in their order in the next succeeding rules. Of the rest, there is no so direct enumeration; the commentator has to infer them from their recognition by rules found in later portions of the treatise. Thus, he finds *anusvâra* acknowledged as an alphabetic element in rule 34 of this chapter, which teaches that it has the quantity of a short vowel; for, he says, "since it is made the substrate of a specific quantity, it is itself a concrete thing, and not, like nasalization, a quality." A passage from the Çikshâ, it is true, appears inconsistent with this, but finds its sufficient explanation in the circumstance that that work includes in one expression the concrete thing and its quality. The cited passage is not to be found in the known text of the

tâthâ hi: a â âz i î îz u û ûz r ṛ ḷ e âi o âu iti svarâh shodâṣa: ka kha ga gha na ca cha ja jha na ta tha da dha na ta tha da dha na pa pha ba bha ma iti sparṣâh pañcaviṅcatiḥ: ya ra la va iti catasro 'ntastâh: ga sha sa ha ḥkaḥ ḥpaḥ iti shad âshmanâh: anusvâraç ca (i.34) iti sâtrenâ 'nusvâra uktâh: kâlavigeshâ-prayatvâd asâu "dharmî na tv" anusâsikavad" dharmâh: vi-dher" madhyasthandâsikya" iti çikshâvacane" satî" dharmadhar-miṇor abhedavivakshayo 'papadyate: atha visarjanîyâh (viii.5) ity anena" visarjanîya uktâh: nâsikâvivaraṇâd ânu-nâsikyam (ii.52) ity anena" raṅga uktâh: pr̥ktasvarât paro lo ḍam (xiii.16) ity anena" lakâra uktâh: sparṣâd anuttamâd (xxi.12) iti catvâro yamâ uktâh: rephoshmasaṃyoge repha-svarabhaktir (xxi.15) iti svarabhaktir uktâ: anena kramena

Çikshâ (and the same is the case with several of the passages quoted later: see the additional notes): it is given again, with more fullness, under viii.15. Next, for the *visarjanīya*, which our Prāṭicākhya does not count among the spirants, is given as authority rule 5 of the eighth chapter, a rule introductory to the euphonic changes of a final *h*. The commentator brings in as next constituent of the alphabet an element which he calls *rañga*, and for which he cites the rule (ii.52) that “nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nasal passage.” The word *rañga*, ‘coloring,’ though a common name for the nasal tinge of utterance, is not found in our Prāṭicākhya, nor even used in the commentary excepting here and under ii.52. What is described in the latter rule is in fact a “quality” (*dharma*), and not a “qualified” or concrete thing (*dharmin*); and its inclusion in the alphabet would stultify the argument with which the inclusion of *anusvāra* was but just now supported. It would seem that the commentator ought to be aiming here at the *nāsikya*, or euphonic insertion between *h* and a following nasal mute, and should quote for it rule xxi.14; he does not otherwise take account of it in his list, while yet it is precisely as well entitled to a place there as are the *yamas*. The nasalized semivowels, it is true, into which *n* and *m* are directed to be converted before *y*, *l*, *v* (v.26-8), are also left out of the enumeration, unless we suppose the *rañga* to be meant to apply to their nasality; and I think it altogether likely that the commentator had them in view in its definition: but this is only avoiding one difficulty by running into two worse ones—namely, by omitting the *nāsikya*, and by reckoning as a member of the alphabet what is really only one of the constituent elements of certain sounds. Further, rule xiii.16 is made the warrant for the lingual *l*, rule xxi.12 for the four *yamas*, and rule xxi.15, finally, for the *svarabhakti*: and the conclusion is reached that “by this process, the number of sixty is clearly derivable from the rules themselves as that of the letters in the Yajur-Veda.”

*yājurvedikavarṇānāṁ*<sup>17</sup> *shashtisamkhyā sūtrata eva vispaṣṭā drashtavyā. nanu*

*trishashtīḥ catuṣshashtīr vā varṇāḥ gambhumate*<sup>18</sup> *matāḥ:*

*iti çikshāvacane sati katham shashtisamkhyā niyamyate: etaḥ*<sup>19</sup> *laukikavāidikaśarvavarṇavishayam*<sup>20</sup> *iti*<sup>21</sup> *çikshāvacane na virodhaḥ: atra tu*<sup>22</sup> *sūtrāir etāvadān varṇānām*<sup>23</sup> *evo 'palambhād esha eva*<sup>24</sup> *nirṇayo varṇitah*<sup>25</sup>.

*varṇānān samāmnāyo varṇasamāmnāyah.*

(1) G. M. *maṅgalādyaneakārtha*. (2) W. G. M. *çiksh-*. G. and M. always write *çikshā*, B. and O. always *çikshā*; W. has *ç-* only in one other place (under xiv.28). (3) W. B. *aho*. (4) G. M. *-ryatā*; W. adds *vā*. (5) G. M. *pithe kramo*. (6) W. B. om. (7) W. *çishyāir*. (8) B. *shka*. (9) B. *shpa*. (10) G. M. om. (11) B. *dharmaṇatvāid anunā-sikah*. (12) G. ins. *ādharma*. (13) G. M. *-kād*. (14) G. M. *-nam*. (15) B. om.; G. M. *tu*. (16) B. G. M. om. (17) W. *-vāid-*. (18) B. *am̐umate*. (19) G. M. *tal*. (20) G. M. *-savarṇavarṇa-*. (21) G. M. ins. *na*. (22) G. M. om. (23) G. M. om. (24) G. M. om. (25) B. *nir-ṇitah*.

An objection is now raised and removed. "Considering that the Çikshâ says 'the letters are regarded as sixty-three or sixty-four, in the opinion of Çambhu' (Çikshâ, verse 3; see Weber's edition of the treatise, in his *Indische Studien*, iv.348-9), how is the number sixty established? Answer: there is no inconsistency with the *dictum* of the Çikshâ, seeing that the latter has in view the whole body of sounds, as used both in the Veda and in common life; while here the determination (of sixty) is derived from the assumption of just so many letters by the rules of the treatise."

The alphabetic scheme is, then, as follows:

Vowels	{ simple,	<i>a ā d āz i ī īz u ū ūz</i>	9	16
	{ impure and diphthongs,	<i>ṛ ṝ ṝ̄ e āi o āu</i>	7	
Mutes	{ guttural,	<i>k kh g gh ṇ</i>	5	25
	{ palatal,	<i>c ch j jh ṇ</i>	5	
	{ lingual,	<i>t th d dh n</i>	5	
	{ dental,	<i>t th d dh n</i>	5	
	{ labial,	<i>p ph b bh m</i>	5	
Semivowels,		<i>y r l v</i>	4	
Spirants,		<i>ś ṣ sh s ṣ h</i>	6	
Anusvāra,		<i>ṁ</i>	1	
Visarjaniya,		<i>h</i>	1	
Lingual <i>l</i> ,		<i>l</i>	1	
Nāsikya,		(not written)	1	
Yamas,		do.	4	
Svarabhakti,		do.	1	
whole number of letters			60	

With the exception of the nasal *y, l, v*, already referred to, this list includes all the alphabetic sounds treated of by the Prātiçākhyā. For what concerns the peculiarities of their character or classification, see the special rules of which they are the subject; as also, for the differences between the teachings of this and of the other kindred treatises with reference to them. Only the Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhyā includes in its text a complete list and enumeration of letters, and that by an afterthought, in a later and less genuine chapter (viii.1-31).

## अथ नवादितः समानाक्षराणि ॥ २ ॥

2. Now the nine at the beginning are simple vowels.

2. *athe* 'ti *saṁjñādhikārārthaḥ*: *asmin*<sup>1</sup> *varṇasamāmn̄dya ādita ārabhya nava varṇāḥ samānākṣharasaṁjñā bhavanti*: 'yathā: *a ā d āz i ī īz u ū ūz*. *saṁjñādyāḥ*<sup>2</sup> *prayojanam*: *dīrghañ samānākṣhare savarṇapare* (x.2) *ity ādi. nanv idr̥ṣī mahatī saṁjñā kimarthā*: *çikshādīçāstraprasiddhyanurōdhāye*<sup>3</sup> 'ti *brāmah*.

<sup>1</sup> B. *tasmin*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. *a ā d āz ity om. -di-*.

<sup>3</sup> G. M. *-jñā*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-tham*. <sup>5</sup> G. M.

Literally, 'are homogeneous syllables;' *samānākshara* and its correlative *saṁdhyakshara*, 'syllable of combination,' being the current names for simple vowel and for diphthong; the latter, however, is not used in this treatise. The nine intended are, as shown in the preceding list, *a ā as i īz u ū āz*. The *r* and *l* vowels are denied the quality of simplicity or homogeneity, although their structure as composed of heterogeneous elements is not further described; the Rik Pr. (xiii.14), the Vāj. Pr. (iv.145), and the Ath. Pr. (i.37-9) give the details of their formation, while nevertheless the two first expressly include *r* and *ṛ* among the *samānāksharas* (omitting *l*, apparently, because no case anywhere occurs that should test its quality), and the same classification is inferribly recognized by the last.

The commentator explains the *atha* of this rule as signifying the introduction of the subject of names or technical appellations (*saṁjñā*), and cites, as example of the use of the term, rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel. Finally, the unwieldiness of the long word *samānākshara* striking his mind, he asks "why such a big name?" and relieves himself by the answer "we say, in order to correspond with the established usage of the Çikshā and other text-books." The Çikshā as we know it, it may be remarked, does not employ the term.

द्वे सवर्णे ऋस्वद्वि ॥ ३ ॥

3. Two and two, short and long, are similar.

That is to say, as the commentary explains, of these simple vowels, two and two short, two and two long, or a long and a short, are called "similar." The meaning seems rather to be that, of the three triplets which make up the category of simple vowels, the first two in each triplet, the short and the long, will be designated as "similar"—to the exclusion, namely, of the *pluta* or protracted vowels. The term is used but once in the treatise (namely in x.2, the rule last above quoted), as applied to vowels, and nothing is practically gained by denying its inclusion of the protracted vowels, since these are specially protected from coalescence by the rule x.24. The *r*-vowels are here again shut out, as in the preceding rule; and, in fact, no case occurs in the Vedic text in which two of them are fused into one.

3. *teshu*<sup>1</sup> *samānākshareshu dvedve hrasve dvedve dīrghe*<sup>2</sup> *hrasva-dīrghe*<sup>3</sup> *dīrghahrasve vā*<sup>4</sup> *'kshare parasparam savarnasamjñe bhavataḥ. iyam anvarthasamjñā: savarnatvaṁ nāma sādīcyaṁ ucyate: tasmād akārādīnam ikārādibhir na savarnasamjñāṣaṅkā bhīnasthānaprayatnatvād anayoḥ. samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: dīrghañ samānākshare savarnapare (x.2) iti.*

*hrasvaṁ ca dīrghaṁ ca hrasvadīrghe.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eteshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ins. vā*. <sup>3</sup> B. *om.*; G. M. *ins. vā*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-tmā*.

The word translated 'similar' means literally 'of identical color' (i. e. sound), and is several times applied later to identity of consonantal sound. It is, as the commentator points out, a self-explaining term, or one whose application is directly in accordance with its natural meaning (*anvārtha*); and hence no suspicion is to be entertained of the inclusion of *a* and *i*, for instance, as "similar," because of their different mode of organic production. As example of the use of the term is again cited x.2.

## न सुतपूर्वम् ॥ ४ ॥

### 4. Not so, when a protracted vowel precedes.

This is an arbitrary exclusion, made to fit a particular case, which might with more evident propriety have been provided for later, where such cases are under treatment, rather than here in the preliminary definition of terms (compare a somewhat similar case in the Rik Pr., i.1, r. 4). The commentator paraphrases the rule "a simple vowel having a protracted one before it is not termed 'similar,'" and goes on to cite and explain in full the case to which it applies. In the phrase *agne: iti: āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), the word *agne* has its final diphthong protracted, and becomes *agnā'si*. By the rule (x.2) for the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel, this would then unite with the following word to form *agnā'si'iti*. The quality of similarity, however, being denied by the present rule to the final *i*, it is treated as a dissimilar vowel, being first converted into *y* by rule x.15, the *y* dropped by x.19, and the coalescence of the remaining *ā* with the following *i* (as prescribed by x.4) prevented by x.24: thus is assured the reading *agnā's ity āha*.

## षोडशादितः स्वराः ॥ ५ ॥

### 5. The sixteen at the beginning are vowels.

Namely, says the commentator, the sixteen beginning with *a* and ending with *au*. As example of the use of the technical term

4. *plutapūrvam samānāksharam savarṇasamjñam na bhavati. plutam asmāt pūrvam iti plutapūrvam. yathā: agnā's ity āhe 'ty ātra dīrghaṁ samānākshare savarṇapare (x.2) ity ekādeṣaḥ prasaktaḥ: tac cā 'nisṭam: pratishiddhāyām tv evaṁ savarṇasamjñāyām pārīcshyād ivarṇokārāu yavakārāv (x.15) iti pūrvasye 'kārasya yatvaṁ syāt': sa cā yakāro lupyete tv avarṇapūrvāu yavakārāv (x.19) iti lupyate: yakāre lupte sati ivarṇapara ekāram (x.4) ity ekāraḥ<sup>2</sup> prasaktaḥ: so 'pi<sup>1</sup> nishidhyate na plutapragrahāv (x.24) ity anena: tasmād agnā's ity āhe 'ti prasidhyati<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ekādeṣaḥ. <sup>3</sup> G. M. vi. <sup>4</sup> G. M. sidhyati.

*svara*, 'vowel,' he quotes the rule (ix.10) prescribing the conversion of *visarjanīya* into *y* before a vowel.

Our *Prāticākhya* is to be commended for not including in its list of vowels the long *ī*, and for postulating no useless protracted forms of *r* and *l*.

## शेषो व्यञ्जनानि ॥ ६ ॥

6. The rest are consonants.

As example of the term *vyañjana*, 'consonant,' rule xxi.1, which pronounces the consonant a member of the adjacent vowel, is cited in the commentary, according to the two manuscripts from northern India; those from the south substitute for it the opening rule of the third chapter, and also omit the explanatory statement "beginning with *k* and ending with *svarabhakti*," which is given by the others.

## आद्याः पञ्चविंशति स्पर्शाः ॥ ७ ॥

7. The first twenty-five are mutes.

The commentator explains: "among the consonants, the first twenty-five letters are called mutes" (*sparṣa*, literally 'contact'). The northern manuscripts add, as under the last rule, "beginning with *k*, and ending with *m*." It is next pointed out that rules 2 and 5 contain the specification *ādītaḥ*, 'at the beginning,' and that the different phraseology of this rule, namely *ādyaḥ*, 'first,' indicates a difference of meaning: it signifies that the sounds referred to

5. *varṇasamāmnāyasyā*<sup>1</sup> "dita śrabhya śhoḍaṣa varṇāḥ svarasamjñā bhavanti: akārādaya ākārāparyantā ity arthaḥ. samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: atha svaraparo yakāram (ix.10) ity ādi.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *varṇānām sam-*.

6. *svarebhyah śesho varṇarāḍir vyañjanasamjñā bhavati: 'kakārādisvarabhaktiparyantā ity arthaḥ'. samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: 'vyañjanañ svarāṅgam*<sup>2</sup> (xxi.1) *iti.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *athā "dau uttare vibhūge hrasvān vyañjanapara (iii.1).*

7. *vyañjaneshv ādyāḥ pañcaviṃśativarṇā sparṣasamjñā bhavanti: 'kakārādayo makārāntāḥ'. 'samjñādyāḥ prayojanam: sparṣa sparṣaparaḥ (xiv.27)<sup>2</sup>. atha navā "ditaḥ samānāksharāṇi (i.2): śhoḍaṣā "ditaḥ svarāḥ (i.5) itivād ādita iti vaktavya ādyā iti śabdāntaraprayogo 'rthāntarasūcakaḥ: vyañjaneshv ādyā na tu svareṣv ādyā iti vijñeyam*<sup>3</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. remove to end of exposition, and for *sparṣaparaḥ* read *sparṣa ity ādi*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. *jñeyam*.



are first among the consonants, not first among the vowels (better, we should say, not first in the whole list). Of this style of interpretation, which forces a special significance into very innocent variations of phraseology, we shall meet with other and more striking examples farther on.

Rule xiv.27 is given as instance of the employment of the technical term here defined

पराश्रतस्रो ऽन्तस्थाः ॥ ८ ॥

8. The next four are semivowels.

The four semivowels are *y*, *r*, *l*, *v*. The rule cited by the commentary in illustration of the use of the term "semivowel" (*antasthā*, i. e. *antah-sthā*, 'standing between, intermediate [between consonant and vowel]': see note to Ath. Pr. i.30) is one (v.28) prescribing the treatment of final *m* before an initial semivowel.

परं षड्भ्याः ॥ ९ ॥

9. The next six are spirants.

Namely, the three sibilants, *ç*, *sh*, and *s*, the *jihvāmālīya*, *ç*, the *upadhmanīya*, *ç*, and the aspiration, *h*. As regards the sounds to which the name *ashman*, 'flatus,' shall be given, the phonetic treatises are greatly at variance. The Vāj. Pr. (viii.22) limits the class to the sibilants and *h*; the Ath. Pr. (see note to i.31) apparently adds the guttural and labial spirants and the more indistinct *visarjunīya*; the Rik Pr. (i.2), these and the *anusvāra*. We have an equal right to be surprised at the inclusion of this last in the class, and at the exclusion from it, by our treatise, of the *visarjunīya*.

To instance the employment of "spirant," the comment cites the rule (xiv.16) forbidding the duplication of a spirant before a vowel.

स्पर्शानामानुपूर्व्येण पञ्चपञ्च वर्गाः ॥ १० ॥

10. Of the mutes, the successive fives are the series.

The commentary paraphrases: "among the mutes, five and five sounds, in their order, have the designation 'series;' they begin respectively with *k*, *c*, *ç*, *t*, *p*, and end with *ñ*, *ṇ*, *ṇ*, *n*, *m*." This

8. *spurcebhyaḥ pare catvāro varṇā antasthāsamjñā bhavanti. samjñādyāḥ prayojanam*: 'antasthāparaḥ ca savarṇam anusāsikam (v.28) ity ādi.

<sup>1</sup> A lacuna in W., extending to the word *prayojanam* in the commentary to the next rule.

9. *antasthābhyaḥ pare śaḍ varṇā āshmasamjñā bhavanti. samjñādyāḥ prayojanam*: *āshmaḥ svaraparaḥ* (xiv.16) *ity ādi*.

exposition is in accordance with the requirements of the context, the treatise being here engaged in defining its technical terms. Otherwise, we might divide ---- *pañca pañcavargāḥ*, and translate, like the corresponding rule in the Rik Pr. (i.2), 'there are five series, of five each.'

The illustrative rule (xiv.20) cited in the comment teaches the non-duplication of a mute of the lingual series before one of the dental series.

## प्रथमद्वितीयतृतीयचतुर्थोत्तमाः ॥ ११ ॥

11. And are called first, second, third, fourth, and last.

Each series of five mutes, that is to say, is composed of a surd, a surd aspirate, a sonant, a sonant aspirate, and a nasal, as *t, th, d, dh, n*; and these classes are named according to their order in the several series. The commentator makes no note here of the physical difference of the classes, but says "In each series, the sounds, in their order, are styled first, second, third, fourth, and last. Even though a name founded on enumeration obviously belongs to them [is assured them, without a special rule to that effect], yet, for the purpose of denying appellation on the ground of any other enumeration, the technical terms 'first' and so on are prescribed, to enjoin a certain enumeration.(?) How so? Why, to establish the designation 'first' and so on for *k* and its successors alone, and to deny to the vowels, semi-vowels; spirants, etc., designations founded on their enumeration." And he proceeds to cite four rules (ii.9; xiv.12, 24; viii.3: but the southern MSS. cite v.38 instead of ii.9) as examples of the use of the five terms defined.

10. *sparyānām madhya ānupūrcyeṇa pañcapañca varṇā<sup>1</sup> var-gasañjñā bhavanti: ka-ca-ta-ta-pādāyo<sup>2</sup> ā-ā-ā-ā-māntā ity arthaḥ. sañjñāyāḥ prayojanam: ṭavargaḥ ca ṭavargaparaḥ (xiv.20) iti.<sup>3</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -pādāyāḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. om. the cited rule; G. M. *ity ādi.*

11. *ekāḥkusmin varge yathākrameṇa<sup>1</sup> varṇāḥ prathamadvitīyatrītyacaturthottamasañjñā bhavanti: siddhe 'pi saṅkhyāni-mitte nāmanī<sup>2</sup> saṅkhyāntarānabhidhānārtham<sup>3</sup> saṅkhyāntaram<sup>4</sup> kathayitum prathamādisañjñāvidhānam: tat katham: kakāra-dīnām eva<sup>5</sup> prathamādisañjñāpratyaṅgārtham: svarāntasthoshma-prabhṛtishu tatsaṅkhyāsañjñāpratishedhārtham<sup>6</sup>. sañjñāyāḥ prayojanam: prathama śshmaparo dvitīyam (xiv.12): trītiyaṅ svaraghoshavatparaḥ (viii.3): kakāro kacatur-theshu (ii.9):<sup>7</sup> nā 'nuttama uttamaparaḥ (xiv.24): ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -kramam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. nāmni. <sup>3</sup> B. saṅkhyāntarābh-; G. M. saṅkhyābh-. <sup>4</sup> M. sañjñāntaram: as to the true reading and interpretation of this clause I am by no means confident. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. tu saṅkhyā-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. substitute for this rule part of v.38, viz. *prathamapūrvā kakāraḥ caturtham tasya sastiṇam.*

आप्रावोपाभ्यधिप्रतिपरिविनीत्युपसर्गाः ॥ १५ ॥

15. *Ā, pra, āva, ūpa, abhi, adhi, prati, pari, vi, ni*—these are prepositions.

These ten words are but half the number which are reckoned as prepositions by the Rik and Vāj. Prātiçākhyas (R. Pr. xii.6; V. Pr. vi.24) and by Pāṇini (see the *gana prādayaḥ*). The commentator notes the discordance with Pāṇini, and inquires why the maker of this rule presumingly cuts short the list of prepositions with the word *iti* in it. His reply is, that only so many are recognized by the Yajur-Veda. Another objection which he raises and removes, arriving at the comfortable conclusion “therefore there is no discordance whatever,” I do not see the point of. The discordance is a real one, and difficult to explain. The term preposition (*upasarga*) is used in three of the rules of the treatise, viz. vi.4 (which is the cited instance in the commentary), x.9, and xiv.8: for the bearing of the restriction in number, see the notes on those rules.

वर्णः कारोत्तरो वर्णाख्या ॥ १६ ॥

16. A sound followed by *kāra* is the name of that sound.

That is, for example, *akāra* is the name of *a*, *ekāra* of *e*, and so on. The Vāj. Pr. (i.37) is the only other treatise which takes the trouble to prescribe this usage, common to them all. Our own refers to it also in a later rule (xxii.4). The word *kāra* means ‘making, producing.’ It is in the rules of the Prātiçākhyas added not only to simple alphabetic sounds (*varṇa*) as their names, but also to syllables like *aḥ* and *an* (see below, rules 23, 53), and the

15. .... *ity ete śabdā upasargasamjñā bhavanti. nanu prapārāpasamanvavanirduṣyān ityādi pāṇinīyā viśeshena bhananti*<sup>1</sup>: *katham atra sūtrakṛtā nīrargalam upasargā itīcābdena saṁkucitā ucyante. yajurvedaviśhaya etāvanta eva ’ti mantavyam. tarhi prapārāpasam<sup>2</sup> iti samuccaye viśeshapāṭhaḥ<sup>3</sup> katham upalābh-yate<sup>4</sup>. itiparatvavidhāne tasya tātparyam na tā ’pasargasamjñā-vidhāne viśeshapāṭhaḥ<sup>5</sup>: tasmān na kenacid virodhaḥ. samjñā-yāḥ prayojanam: upasarganishpārvo ’nudātte pade (vi.4). itīcābdāḥ prakāravat.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. and G. p. m. *bhavanti*. <sup>2</sup> B. *prāpaparāvasam*; G. M. *prāpasam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *viśeshah*; W. *viśesham*. <sup>4</sup> B. *lakshyate*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *viśeshah* p.

16. *kārottaro varṇo varṇasyā ’khyā bhavati. yathā: athādi ’kārekārāv (iv.8) iti.*<sup>1</sup> *kāraśabda uttaro yasmād asau kārot-tarah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ity ādi*.

commentator very frequently uses it to make names for brief words, like *ca*.

Rule iv.8, respecting *e* and *i*, is the chosen illustration of the combination here taught.

अकारव्यवेतो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. But with an *a* interposed, in the case of the consonants.

That is, the name of *k*, for instance, is (*k-a-kāra*) *kakāra*. Compare the equivalent rule, Vāj. Pr. i.38.

The commentator cites rule v.22, respecting the conversion of *t* to *c*.

न विसर्जनीयजिह्वामूलीयोपध्मानीयानुस्वारनासि-  
क्यानाम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Not of *visarjanīya*, *jihvāmūliya*, *upadhmānīya*, *anuvāra*, and the *nāsikyas*.

The term *nāsikya* designates here, of course, the nasal figments taught in rules xxi. 12–14. All these indistinct, hardly articulate, sounds must be spoken of by their descriptive titles, not by any name founded upon their form. The commentator explains that the appending of *kāra* to the sounds here specified—which would otherwise be regular, since they come under the category of *varṇa*, ‘alphabetic elements’—is annulled by the rule: adding as a reason, that they are nowhere met with thus treated. He then

17. *akāravavyavahito*<sup>1</sup> *varṇaḥ kārāṣabdottaro vyañjanānām ākhyā bhavati. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *takāraṣ cakāram* (v.22) *ity ādi. akāreṇa vyavahito*<sup>3</sup>: *kāravavyavetaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> W. -*vyaveto*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. put this word after the cited rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyaveto*.

18. *visarjanīyādīnām varṇatvāviśeṣāt kārottaratvam prāptam anena nivartyate: na khalu visarjanīyādīnāni kārottaratā bhavati: kutaḥ: sarvatra*<sup>1</sup> *prayogānupalambhāt. nanu yathā varṇaḥ kārottaro varṇākhyā* (i.16) *iti varṇaṣabdāvdeśasyāi*<sup>2</sup> *va kārottaratvam nakāro nakāram* (vii.1 or xiii.6) *ity ādi: na tu vācakasyāi*<sup>3</sup> *va*<sup>4</sup>: *anyathā varṇakāra iti syāt: tadvad*<sup>5</sup> *visarjanīyādīnām*<sup>6</sup> *atrā*<sup>7</sup> *pi vācyagrahaṇam eva yuktam: nā*<sup>8</sup> *nyathā: tathā sati vācakaparatayā vararucyādiviracitam*<sup>9</sup> *udāharaṇam avasāne ravisarjanīya* (xiv.15) *ity ādy aruciram: iti cet: mādī*<sup>10</sup> *vam maṁsthāḥ: vācyānām*<sup>11</sup> *kevalānām aprayogād atra vācyavācakayor abhedavivakṣhayā sūtrasaranir ity udāharaṇaga manikā*<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *taiha*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> W. *tad*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *vararucād*; G. M. *vārarucād*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *vācyādīnām*. <sup>7</sup> W. -*nam gam*.

goes on to raise and refute a very subtle and hair-splitting objection. In rule 16, he says, *kāra* is prescribed to be added not to the vocable (*vācaka*) *varṇa*, 'sound,' itself, but only to the thing designated (*vācya*) by that vocable; so likewise in this rule it is proper to understand by *visarjanīya* etc. the things designated by those words, and nothing else (and hence, the rule must not be interpreted as implying that *visarjanīya* and the other names given are, in default of those formed with *kāra*, the accepted designations for the sounds in question). This being the case, the illustration given under the rule by Vararuci and others—namely, rule xiv.15, speaking of *r* and "*visarjanīya*" as not liable to duplication—is an unsuitable one. Such is the objection. The reply is: you must not think so; since the sounds designated by the terms in the rule are actually nowhere employed by themselves (as designations), the rule simply intends to include designation and thing designated in one expression; and the quoted example is proper enough.

एफस्तु रस्य ॥ ११ ॥

19. Of *r*, however, *epha* forms the name.

That is to say, the technical designation of *r* is *repha*; *ra* being also admitted, by rule 21, below: *rakāra* is not found anywhere in the Hindu grammatical literature. This peculiarity of treatment of *r*, as compared with the other consonants, is to be paralleled with the way in which it is written in consonant groups, almost as if a vowel.

The Vāj. Pr. has an equivalent rule (i.40).

The word *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, according to the commentator, is meant to deny the application to *r* of both the rules 16 and 17. Some, he says, hold that it denies only rule 17, or the insertion of *a* between *r* and the appended *kāra*: but this is wrong; for it would imply that the name of *r* was made sometimes by appending *kāra* and sometimes by appending *epha*, just as an alternation is in fact allowed by rule 21 below between *ra* and *repha*, and exemplified by rules vii.11 and xxi.15; while no

19. *rasya tv ephaṣabda' ākhyā bhavati. yathā: repḥośma-parah<sup>2</sup> (xiii.2) iti. repḥasya vyañjanatvāvipeṣhāt prāptam kārot-taratvam akāravvyavetatvam ca: tad ubhayaṁ tuṣabdo nivāra-yati. anye tv anyathā manyante: akāravvyavetatvam eve 'ti: tad asādhu: tathā sati kaddcid ephottaratā<sup>3</sup> kaddcit kārottaratā ce 'vi vikalpāḥ syāt: yathā 'kāro vyañjanānam (i.21) iti vidhānād vikalpāḥ: tathā hi repḥośmasaṁyoḃe. repḥasvarabhak-tiḥ<sup>4</sup> (xxi.15): rashaḥpūrvō javanī<sup>5</sup> (vii.11) ity ādi: na tv evam kārottaratvam api vikalpena<sup>6</sup> svikṛtam<sup>7</sup> kutrācit: tasmād asmad-ukta eva yuktas tuṣabdarthah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *reph*; and M. reads *rephas* in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> W. -*śmaṣabda*. <sup>3</sup> B. *rephakṣaratā*; W. *reph*-. <sup>4</sup> W. B. 'pi. <sup>5</sup> W. B. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *naka*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*taḥ*.

instance of a name formed with *kāra* is anywhere to be met with. This is a very easy demolition of a very insignificant man of straw.

ह्रस्वो वर्णोत्तिरस्त्रयाणाम् ॥ २० ॥

20. The short vowel, with *varṇa* after it, is the name of the three vowels.

The "three vowels" referred to are the three quantities—short, long, and protracted—of the vowels *a*, *i*, *u*, respectively; *varṇa*, in this case, indicating only the 'color,' or phonetic complexion, of the vowel, without regard to its length. The Ath. Pr. has the same usage of this term, but without defining it by rule. As our treatise acknowledged no protracted *r*, and neither a long nor a protracted *l*, it does not admit the compounds *rvarṇa* and *lvarṇa*: of the other three it frequently avails itself. The instance selected by the commentator is rule x.4, which directs the combination of *a* with a following *i*, *ē*, *is* into *e*.

अकारो व्यञ्जनानाम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. An *a* forms the names of consonants.

This rule allows *uṣ* to call a consonant not only, as prescribed in rules 16 and 17 above, by a name formed by adding *kāra* with *a* interposed, but also by one formed with *a* alone. The commentator's example is rule v.22, where *t* and *c* are referred to as *ta-kāra*, *ca-kāra*, and *ç*, *c* again, and *ch*, as *ça*, *ca*, and *cha*. If something merely additional to the *kāra*, instead of alternative with it, were intended in the rule, we are told, rule 17 would be made meaningless. But, says an objector, why use *kāra* at all for the purpose, when even along with it the *a* has to be brought into requisition? let this alone furnish the name. The reasonableness of the objection is conceded, but the commentator alleges as sufficient justification of the practice followed, that it is in accordance with that of the Çikshā and other text-books.

He continues: others assert that the *a* added to a consonant indicates (not that consonant pure and simple, but) a syllable composed of the consonant and any following vowel; as for instance in rule ix.3, "*visarjanīya* followed by *kṣa* is not assimilated;" where the examples are *manah kṣeme* (v.2.17), *ghanāghanah kṣobhanah* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>: so all the MSS., both here and under ix.3; my MS. of the Sanhitā reads *kṣobhanih*), and *ukthaçāsaḥ kṣāma* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>). This is unsound; for then we should have to read *iṣhe tvā* (for *iṣhe tvā*, i.1.1 et al.), by the rule vii.13, "after *vāghā* and *sha*, *t* becomes *ṭ*;" which is wrong. Moreover, in the rule (xii.

20. *varṇottaro hrasvo* <sup>1</sup> *hrasvadīrghapluṭānām akhyā bhavati. yathā: i varṇa para ekāram (x.4) ity ādi. varṇaṣabda uttaro yasmād asāu varṇottaraḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *trayānām*.

4) "ya, va, na, ha, when followed by vowels," the final specification would be useless, because already implied in the names given to the letters. Hence the opinion referred to is wrong, and the name taught by the rule indicates the consonant alone.

As for the actual usage of the treatise, it is somewhat equally divided between the two modes of designation of the consonants: names formed with *a* alone occur nearly sixty times; with *akāra*, nearly eighty times. This is exclusive of *r*, which is called *ra* four times, *repha* fifteen times.

Compare rule i.39 of the Vâj. Pr.

## ग्रहणस्य च ॥ २२ ॥

22. As also, of a cited word.

The term *grahana* is used in only two other rules of the Prâti-*śākhya* (i.24,50), but occurs in the commentary times innumerable, in the sense of 'citation, word taken or extracted from the Sanhitâ to be made the subject of some prescription' (root *grah*, 'seize, take'). The commentator, however, gives it an artificial and false etymology: it denotes, he says, either a word respecting which something is to be enjoined (*lakshya*), or one which is the cause (*nimitta*) of an effect produced in some other word. The former is called *grahana* because it is "seized" (i. e. "affected"); the latter, because something is "seized" or "affected" by it. It is, he continues, a part of a word, a theme or base. The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule brings forward, or indicates the continued implication of, the *a* of the preceding rule. The meaning is, then, that *a* forms the name of a citation, a theme, in whatever situation it may occur.

21. *vyañjanānām akāra ākhyā bhavati. yathā: takāraḥ ca kārāṇāṁ cacachāparaḥ. (v.22) ity ādi. kāraḥ abaddhotaravam idam ca vikatpyate: samuccaye tv akāravavyaveto vyañjanānām (i. 17) iti vyartham syāt. nanu tarhi kārottaratā kimarthā: tadānām api svarūpenā 'kāralābhāt: sa eva 'khyā bhavatu. satyam: śikshādīḍḍastraprasiddhasamketānusāreṇa 'ti parihārah. apare tu saṅgirante: akārah sarvasvarāntasya vyañjanasya grāhaka iti: yathā: man-----: ghan-----: ukth-----: ity ādi na kshaparaḥ (ix.3) iti nishedhasyo 'ddharanām syād iti. tad asdram: kutah: vāghāshapūrvas tash tam (vii.13) iti shapārvatvāt takārasya tātve kṛte ish----- iti syāt: tac cā 'nishṭam: kim ca: yavanahasvarapareshv (xii.4) iti atra svaraparaḥ abdo vyarthah syāt: bhavanmate sarvasvarāntasya<sup>10</sup> svikāranīyamāt: tasmād anupapannam eva<sup>11</sup> tan matam manmahe: kim tu varṇamātrasyā 'khyā.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. omit these first two words of the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*tanāḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*tham*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*avyavāyārū*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*sārāya*. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -*shatvapū*. <sup>9</sup> W. -*yavanahaparasvar*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -*ntamātrasya*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*evā*.

That is to say, if a word be cited in the text of a rule by its theme-ending *a*, all its cases or other derivative forms are to be regarded as equally had in view by the rule. Reference is twice made to this principle hereafter by the commentator (under rules vi.13 and x.14), to justify such inclusions. The latter of the cases he here brings up, as example of a *nimitta*, or citation of an affecting cause; the cited word is *oshtha*, which is declared to occasion the loss of a preceding *a* or *ā*: the only two instances of this combination which the Sanhitā contains are quoted in illustration, viz. *svāh' oshthābhyām* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>), and *upayāmam adharen' oshthena* (v.7.12). As example of a *lakshya*, or citation of a word to be determined by rule, he quotes the end of rule xvi.26, with its illustrative citations, *kiñçilaç caturthaḥ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *kiñçildya'cakshayandya ca* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>). This latter example is not very well chosen, as the case is a somewhat difficult and anomalous one (see the note on xvi.26).

This rule, like some of those that follow, is of very small value, since final *a* is not the necessary sign of a cited theme in which other cases are included; and, on the other hand, parts of words not ending in *a* are often cited "for the sake of the inclusion of many words" (*bahūpādānārtham*).

## अःकार आगमविकारितोपिनाम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. *Ah* makes the name of an increment, or of an element suffering alteration or elision.

Here, again, is a precept hardly called for, as the construction and connection of each rule shows in what way any nominative it contains is to be understood, without such an explanation as this, which applies only to a part of the cases, and is unable to teach us which of the three possibilities it contemplates is the actuality in any given case. Moreover, it is faultily expressed, and the commentator is obliged to explain that *ah* here stands for the ending of the nominative case, in the dual and plural as well as the singular. He quotes in illustration five rules: xiv.5 exemplifies a singular increment; vii.1, a singular altered element; v.19, a singular elision; v.25, two-fold altered elements; xxi.12, plural increments.

22. *'lakshyam nimittam ca grahaṇam ity ucyate: gr̥hyata<sup>2</sup> iti grahaṇam: gr̥hyata anene 'ti nimittam api grahaṇam: paddi-kadeçaḥ prātīpadikam iti yāvat: cakāraḥ pūrvasūtroktam akāram ākarshati: grahaṇasya prātīpadikasya sarvāvasthasyā 'kāra' ākhyā bhavati. yathā: kiñçilakiñçilā (xvi.26) iti parakiñçilaçabdo lakshyam uddharaṇam: yathā: kiñç- cat-----: kiñç- caksh-----: oshthevaḥparō lupyate (x.14) iti tu<sup>4</sup> nimittam: yathā: svā-----: upay-----.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. inserts this passage out of place, between rule 19 and its commentary  
<sup>2</sup> G. *grahanyata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. omit this example. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.



Rule 28, below, is very intimately connected with this, and the insertion of rules 25-27 between is quite unaccountable.

Rik. Pr. i.14 includes the second of the three specifications here made, along with rule 28.

ग्रहणं वा ॥ २४ ॥

24. Or the simple citation.

The commentator says: "Of these—namely the increment etc.—there is in some cases, alternatively, citation; the meaning is, without any *ah*." And he goes on to quote three rules, in which increment (xvi.29), alteration (vii.3), and elision (v.15) are taught otherwise than as prescribed in the preceding rule—which is not, however, thus amended into acceptableness.

आसन्नं संदेहे ॥ २५ ॥

25. In case of doubt, citation is made of the next.

This rule, occurring where it does, appears to have been interpolated by an afterthought, attaching itself to the word *grahanam*, 'citation,' of the preceding rule, without regard to the connection in which that word is used. The meaning is, that when the mere citation of a word from the *Sanhitā* would leave a doubt as to which occurrence of the word is intended, some part of the context, a word or part of a word, is cited along with it. But the commentator's first example and its exposition are quite peculiar. He quotes *svayamātrṇṇām ca vikārṇām co 'ttame* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>), and remarks: "There being a doubt, owing to the occurrence of two *ca*'s in this passage, which of them is to be taken to give the *pragraha*-character [to *uttame*], the one next to the proper subject of the rule [*kāryabhāj*], 'the word undergoing the prescribed

23. *āgamādīnām aḥkāra ākhyā bhavati: aḥkāra iti prathamā-vibhakter upalakṣaṇam. āgamasya yathā: 'dvittīyacaturthayoḥ tu vyañjanottarayoh pūrvah* (xiv.5): *vikārīṇo yathā: atha nakāro nakāram* (vii.1): *lopiṇo yathā: tishṭhantyekayā sapūrvah* (v.19): *ity ekavacanāni: lapurādu lakāram* (v.25): *iti dvivacanam: ānupūrvyān nāsikyāḥ* (xxi.12): *iti bahuvacanam. āgamaḥ ca vikārī ca lopī cā "gama-vikārilopinaḥ: teshām.*

(1) B. om.

24. *teshām āgamādīnām kvacid grahaṇam vā bhavati: aḥkāreṇa vind'pī 'tī tātpariyam. āgamasya yathā: ādiraṇṇhatir* (xvi.29) *ity ādi: vikārīṇo yathā: hanyādūpyamānam ca* (vii.3) *ity ādi: lopīṇo yathā: eśhasasya* (v.15) *ity ādi.*

<sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *iti*.

effect'] is to be assumed, in the rule reading *co 'ttame* [iv.11].<sup>1</sup> He seems to suppose that the "doubt" referred to in the rule concerns the point, which of the two preceding *ca*'s is joined with *uttame* in the precept that establishes the latter's character as a *pragraha* word, and that we need authority for understanding that the latter of the two is taken. This is little less than silly. His other example is taken from rule iv.15, where *ā prshatī* is made *pragraha*, the *ā* being the final letter of the preceding word *yuñjā* (*yuñjā prshatī*, iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>).

Under a later rule (iv.23) this principle is twice referred to, and very curiously and artificially applied. See the note to that rule.

### अनेकस्यापि ॥ २६ ॥

26. Even of more than one.

The genitive in this rule is grammatically inconsistent with the accusative of the one preceding, which I had to translate inaccurately in order to make the connection evident. The commentator declares the "even" (*api*) here to continue in force the word *sañdehe*, 'in case of doubt,' which is hardly to be approved. He interprets: "When there is ambiguity, citation is made of more than one word or sound," and quotes *tishṭhanty ekayā* (v.19) and *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) as examples. But in these we have only one additional word cited, though more than one additional letter; so that both are properly examples under the preceding rule. There is no case, I believe, where more than one word requires to be cited along with that at which the rule aims; of a part of a word containing more than one letter we have instances in vi.2,5 etc. I see no good reason, however, why these should not be regarded as authorized by the preceding rule, and this one, accordingly, omitted as superfluous.

### प्रथमो वर्गीत्तरो वर्गाख्या ॥ २७ ॥

27. A first mute, followed by the word "series," is the name of the series.

25. *sañdehe saty' āsannam 'varṇam padam' vā grhṇīyāt: svay-... ity atra cakāradvayasambhavāt pragrahanimittatvena katarasyo 'pāddnam kartavyam iti sañdehe yad' āsannam kār-yabhājus tad eva svīkartavyam co 'ttame* (iv.11) *iti sūtre'. varṇasya yathā: ā prshatī* (iv.15) *ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *padam varṇam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yadā*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *sarvatra*.

26. *sañdeha anekasya pudasya varṇasya vā grahaṇam bhavati: apiçabdaḥ sañdeha ity anvādiçati<sup>1</sup>. yathā: tishṭhanty ekayā sapūrvāḥ* (v.19): *evo 'ttare* (iv.11) *ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *adiçati*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. om.

The commentator's example is rule xiv.20, "the *t*-series, followed by the *ṭ*-series;" that is to say, a lingual mute followed by a dental. Compare Vâj. Pr. i.64.

अं विकारस्य ॥ २८ ॥

28. *Am* makes the name of a product of alteration.

This is the correlative rule to 23, above, from which it has become strangely separated. The commentator explains, as before, that *am* stands here as representative of the accusative case in any number; but the two examples he gives (v.38 and vii.1) are both of them such as the rule might strictly apply to without any such extension of its meaning.

पूर्व इति पूर्वः ॥ २९ ॥

29. By preceding is meant preceding.

A rule expressed in the form of an identical proposition cannot be claimed to cast much light of itself, but demands a comment as its essential part. Our commentator explains: "Whatever word is pointed out by the qualification 'preceding,' that word is to be understood as designated by its own form in that situation alone; but not, on account of identity of form, another word standing in a different situation. Thus, by the rules (iv.12,13) '*dyāvāprthivī* is *pragraha*;' also the preceding word,' the word *yāvatī* is made a *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī dyāvāprthivī mahitvā* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>); but it is not therefore *pragraha* in the passage *yāvatī vāi prthivī* (v.2.3<sup>1</sup>)."

पर इत्युत्तरः ॥ ३० ॥

30. By following is meant succeeding.

---

27. *vargaṣabdottarah prathamah svavargasyā* <sup>1</sup> *"khyā bhavati: tavargaṣ ca tavargaparah* (xiv.20) *iti. vargaṣabda uttaro yasmād asū vargottarah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. *sva*.

28. *am iti ṣabdo vikārasyā* <sup>1</sup> *"khyā bhavati: am iti dvitīyā dvibakter upalakṣaṇam. yathā: prathamapārvo haḥāraṣ caturtham* (v.38): *atha nakāro nakāram* (vii.1).

29. *yāḥ pūrvāṣabdena nirdiṣṭāḥ* <sup>1</sup> *sa tatrāi 'va svena rūpeṇo 'palakṣhito jñātavyah: na tu rūpasāmānyād anyo bhinnadeṣa-sthah. yathā: dyāvāprthivī: pūrvāṣ ca* (iv.12,13) *iti* <sup>2</sup> *pragraho bhavati* <sup>3</sup> *'ti vakṣhyati: pūrvatvād yāv----* *iti yāvatīṣab-* *dah pragrahaḥ: yāv----* *iti tu* <sup>4</sup> *na syāt pragrahaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *viśiṣhyate.* <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-viśiṣhyati.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *atra.*

This is the counterpart of the preceding rule, and is explained by the commentator in corresponding terms. His illustration is taken from rules iv.49,50, where *dve* and the word following it are declared *pragraha*. In the passage, then, *dve jāye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *jāye* is *pragraha*, but not in the passage *yonir asi jāya e 'hi* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *e 'hi*).

The rule is only once referred to hereafter, namely under iv.52; and there for a purpose which it was not intended to answer.

## ऋकारल्कारौ ऋस्वौ ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *R* and *l* are short.

As examples of short *r* and *l*, the commentator cites *rtavo vāi* (vii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *aklptasya klptyāi* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>).

## अकारश्च ॥ ३२ ॥

32. Also *a*.

"Also" (*ca*), says the commentator, brings forward the implication of "short" from the preceding rule. His example of short *a* is *ayam puraḥ* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup> or 4.3<sup>1</sup>).

## तेन च समानकालस्वरः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. Also any vowel having the same quantity with the latter.

Here again, the "also" continues the implication of the predicate of rule 31, we are told. The only vowels contemplated by the rule, further, are *i* and *u*, since there is an absence of the attribute of like quantity with *a* in the diphthongs. As examples from the *Sanhitā* are quoted *iṣhe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.), *upaprayanto adhvaram* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup> or 7<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit *advharam*), and *atrā 'ha tad urugāyasya* (i.3.6<sup>2</sup>: but see the various readings below). The commentator then raises the objection (without introducing it, as usual,

30. *yaḥ para ity anena viśishyate so 'pi tatrdi 'va svena rūpena pratyetavyaḥ. yathā: dve: paraḥ ca* (iv.49,50) *iti' pragraho bhavati 'ti vakshyati: paratvād dve jā- ity atra jāye iti' pragrahaḥ: 'yo- ity atra ' na pragrahaḥ'.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *śabdah*. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *tu*.

31. *ṛkāraḥ ca lkāraḥ ca hrasvasamjñāu bhavataḥ. yathā: rt- ak-*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.

32. *akāraḥ ca hrasvasamjñāo bhavati: cakāro hrasvatvam' anv- ādīcati. yathā: ay- iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*svam*.

with *nanu*), that the matter of the three rules should have been put into this form: "A is short: also any vowel having like quantity with it;" because, as actually stated, they are liable to the reproach of saying the same thing over twice (since *r* and *l* are of the same quantity as *a*, and are therefore included in the prescription of the present rule). But he replies that the statement is right in its present shape; for *r* and *l* inhere in *r* and *l*; and one might therefore suppose that, being letters of more than one articulating position, they suffered an extension of quantity, and were not short: hence the special rule concerning them. The treatise, as was noticed above (under i.2), nowhere describes the formation of *r* and *l*, though it excludes them from the category of simple vowels.

The rule of the Vāj. Pr. (i.55) is nearly the same with this.

### अनुस्वारश्च ॥ ३४ ॥

#### 34. Also *anusvāra*.

The implication being the same as in the preceding rules, *anusvāra* is here defined as having the quantity of a short vowel. The commentator explains the occasion for the rule as follows: rule xxi.6, which teaches that *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti* are to be attached to the preceding vowel in syllabication, implies the consonantal character of the former; whence, by rule 37, below, it would have the quantity of a half-mora, and its true quantity of a mora requires special definition.

The Vāj. Pr. (iv.147,148) allows *anusvāra* to make with a preceding vowel, either long or short, two moras, oddly enough distributing the time between the two elements, vowel and nasal, in such a way that the latter has a mora and a half after a short vowel, the vowel being itself shortened to a half-mora, while after a long vowel the nasal is itself cut down to a half-mora, and a mora and a half are assigned to the vowel—a highly artificial ar-

33. *tenā 'kāreṇa yas tulyakālaḥ svarāḥ sa ca hrasvo bhavati: atrā' 'pi cakāro hrasvādeṣakāḥ: ikāra ukāraḥ ce' 'ty arthaḥ: saṁdhyakṣharāṇāṁ samānakālatvādbhāvāt. yathā: ish-----: up-----: 'atr-----: akāro hrasvas tena ca samānakālasvara ity ārabdhavyam: ṛkāraḥkārāu hrasvāu iti tu' nā "rabdhavyam: evāṁ ārabdhyamāṇe punaruktatayā gauravam bhaved iti. ucyate: ārabdhavyam evāi 'tat: kutaḥ: ṛkāraḥkārāyor antarā<sup>5</sup> rephalakārāu staḥ: tattatsthānatvād<sup>6</sup> anayoḥ kālavyabhicāraḥ syāt: hrasvatvaṁ na<sup>10</sup> gamyeta<sup>11</sup>: tan mā bhūd ity evam ārabhyate: ṛkāraḥkārāu<sup>12</sup> iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *tatrā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *hrasvatvādeṣakāḥ samānakāla svara iti*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-kālavaratvā-*. <sup>5</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> B. *atrā* "ha only; G. M. *atra hy*; both as if the introduction to what follows. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *anantare*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *tatsth-*. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *avagamyate*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *hrasvāu*.

rangement. The Rik Pr. gives no special statement respecting the quantity of the nasal element, but leaves it to be included among the other consonants, which have half a mora of time each.

All the "short" elements being now enumerated, the commentator quotes, as example of the employment of the term "short," rule iii.1. As example of *anusvāra*, he quotes *tāñ haste* (vi.1.37).

## दिस्तावान्दीर्घः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. An element of twice that quantity is long.

The literal meaning of this rule is, says the commentator, that one of the before-mentioned short vowels, when doubled, is long: but its virtual intent is that a vowel having twice the quantity of a short is long. I have translated in accordance with the latter interpretation. As example of the use of the term "long" is quoted rule x.2, respecting the coalescence of two similar simple vowels into the corresponding long vowel.

## त्रिः सुतः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. An element of three times that quantity is protracted.

The commentator explains the virtual meaning of this rule in the same manner as that of the preceding, and quotes in illustra-

34. *bhavaty anusvāraç ca<sup>1</sup> hrasvasamjñāḥ. yathā: tāñ----- cakāro hrasvānvākaraḥakāḥ<sup>2</sup>: anusvāraḥ svarabhaktiç ca (xxi.6) iti svarapratyañgatvavidhānād<sup>3</sup> anusvārasya vyañjanatvam: tathā sati hrasvārddhakālaṁ vyañjanam (i.37) ity atrā<sup>4</sup> 'rdhamātratvam<sup>5</sup> prāptam<sup>6</sup>: tan mā bhūdi iti hrasvatvam vidhīyate. hrasvasamjñāyāḥ prayojanam: vibhāge hrasvaṁ vyañjanapareḥ (iii.1) iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *api*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *hrasvāk*. <sup>3</sup> MSS. *svaram pr*; W. *-ñgavidh*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-tve*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-te*.

35. *tāvān iti prakṛto hrasva ucyate: dvir iti dvirūpaḥ<sup>1</sup>: tāvān hrasvo dīrghasamjñō bhavati<sup>2</sup> 'ti sūtrayojanā: tātparyam tu hrasvadviguṇakālaḥ<sup>3</sup> svaro dīrghasamjñō bhavati<sup>4</sup> 'ti. samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: dīrghaṁ samānākshare savarnapare (x.2) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-pam*. <sup>2</sup> W. inserts here, out of place, *samjñāyāḥ prayojanam*. <sup>3</sup> B. *-la*; W. *om*. *lah*. <sup>4</sup> W. *om*. *iti*.

36. *atrā 'pi<sup>1</sup> hrasvo 'nuvartate sāmniidhyāt: trir iti trirūpaḥ<sup>2</sup>: trirūpo hrasvaḥ plutasamjñō bhavati<sup>3</sup> 'ti: tātparyam tv atrā 'pi brāmaḥ: hrasvatriguṇakālaḥ svaraḥ plutasamjñō bhavati<sup>4</sup>. samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: na pluta-pragrahāv (x.24) iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ins. sa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*.

tion of the term "protracted" rule x.24, which directs that a protracted and a *pragraha* vowel are not liable to combination.

All the treatises agree closely in their definitions of vowel quantity; see Ath. Pr. i.59-62, and the notes upon those rules.

### रुस्वार्धकालं व्यञ्जनम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. A consonant has half the quantity of a short vowel.

This, the comment reminds us, is a rule defining the length of a consonant, not one giving the meaning of the term consonant. For, if it were the latter, the word "time" in rule xvii.5, which speaks of "the time of a consonant," would be open to the charge of redundancy. We hardly need so trifling and technical a proof of a thing so obvious. As example of a consonant, the word *vāk* (e. g. i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. read instead *vā*) is given us.

Of the other treatises, the Ath. Pr. (i.60) alone differs from this by giving to a consonant a whole mora as its quantity.

### उच्चैरुदात्तः ॥ ३८ ॥

38. A syllable uttered in a high tone is acute.

The commentator enters into no explanation of the meaning of the definition of the acute tone or accent here given, but simply refers us to a later rule (xxii.9); where the action of the organs in producing the higher tone is more particularly described. He adds as example of an acute vowel *sá idhānáḥ* (iv.4:4<sup>5</sup>: but all the MSS. save W. read *sá iti*), and quotes rule xiv.29 as exemplifying the use of the term *udātta*, 'acute' (literally 'elevated'). I have explained in the note to Ath. Pr. i.14-16 why I prefer, instead of transferring the terms *udātta*, *anudātta*, and *svārīta*, to translate them by 'acute,' 'grave,' and 'circumflex,' respectively.

### नीचैरनुदात्तः ॥ ३९ ॥

39. In a low tone, grave.

37. *vyañjanam hrasvārdhakālam bhavati: na tu vyañjanam iti sañjñā: anyathā<sup>1</sup> vyañjanakālaḥ ca svarasya 'trā 'dhikāḥ<sup>2</sup> (xvii.5) iti. 'kālaḥcābdasya pāṇaruktyāpatteḥ. yathā: vāk. hrasvasya 'rdho<sup>3</sup> hrasvārdhaḥ<sup>4</sup>: 'hrasvārdhakālaḥ<sup>5</sup> parimānam yasya<sup>6</sup> tat tatho 'ktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. omit the last two words of the rule. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-dhām*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *hrasvārdham kālaḥ parimānakālo yasya*—a good and consistent reading; B. is corrupt. <sup>6</sup> W. *-lām*.

38. *āyāmo dāruṇyam (xxii.9) iti lakṣaṇalakṣhitāḥ<sup>1</sup> svara udātta ucyate. yathā: sá----- sañjñāyāḥ prayojanam: udāt-tāt paro 'nudāttaḥ svārītam (xiv.29) iti.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-ta*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ity ādi*.

We are again referred to the rule in one of the last chapters (xxii.10) which defines the action of the organs in producing the lower tone. The example for the accent is *avadātām* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. read *avadātām*), of which, in *pada*-text, all the syllables are grave; that for the term *anudātā*, 'grave' (literally, 'not elevated'), is, in W. B., rule iv.43; but in G. M., rule xiv.29.

## समाहारः स्वरितः ॥ ४० ॥

40. Their combination is circumflex.

The commentator explains *samāhāra*, 'combination,' as from *samāhriyate*, 'it is taken together, collected, combined;' and adds, "the accent arising from the mixing of those two is the circumflex (*svarita*). This is a precept concerning the peculiar nature of the accent; its occurrence is taught further on, in one and another place:" and he quotes not less than three of the rules (xiv.29, x.16, and xii.9) which teach under what circumstances the circumflex arises. His example of a circumflexed syllable is *tè 'brūvan* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup> et al.).

This rule is so far ambiguous that it does not tell us in what order the acute and grave tones are to be combined to produce the circumflex accent—whether acute and grave, or grave and acute; but we may perhaps assume that the treatise consciously intends them to be taken in the order in which they are defined by the two preceding rules.

All the authorities practically agree in their general definition of the three kinds of accent (see note to Ath. Pr. i.14-16); and Pāṇini's rules (i.2.29-31) are precisely the same with those here given. As regards the details which form the subject of the following rules of our treatise, the accordance is not so perfect (see note to Ath. Pr. i.17).

## तस्यादिर्द्वैस्तरामुदात्तादनन्तरे वावर्द्धः ऋस्वस्य ॥ ४१ ॥

41. Of this circumflex, in case it immediately follows an

39. *anvavasargaḥ* (xxii.10) *iti*<sup>1</sup> *sūtralakṣitaḥ*<sup>2</sup> *svaro* 'nudātā *ucyate*<sup>3</sup>. *yathā*: av. *saṃjñāyāḥ prayojanam*: *anudātto na nityam* (iv.43) *iti*.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -ta. <sup>3</sup> B. *lakṣhyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. give xiv.29, and *ity ādi*.

40. *tayor udāttānudanāttayor yaḥ samāhārah sa*<sup>1</sup> *svarita ucyate. yathā*; *tè----- samāhriyata iti samāhārah*: *tayor melānājanasvarah*<sup>2</sup> *svarita*<sup>3</sup> *ity arthah. svaritasvarāpavidhir ayam*: *uparishṭāt tu* 'tatratatra *svarito lakṣhyate*<sup>4</sup>: *yathā*: *udāttāt paro* 'nudātāḥ *svaritam* (xiv.29): *udāttayoḥ ca paro* 'nudātāḥ *svaritam* (x.16): *tasminn*<sup>5</sup> *anudātte*<sup>6</sup> *pūrva udāttāḥ svaritam* (xii.9) *ity ādi*.

<sup>1</sup> M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -ra: B. -nyaḥ *svara*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *vak*. <sup>5</sup> W. om. <sup>6</sup> W. *tannudātte*.



acute, the first part, to the extent of half a short vowel, is uttered in a yet higher tone.

That is, higher than the tone of acute, which properly forms its first element; one is tempted to give the word *udāttāt* a double construction, as belonging in idea to *uccāstarām* as well as to *anantare*.

The subject of the more particular definition of the circumflex accent occupies the six following rules, and any comments upon the doctrines laid down will be better reserved until the last rule.

As example of the circumflex, the commentator cites the words *sā idhānāh* (iv. 4.4<sup>5</sup>), already once given (under rule 38); the first syllable of the second word has the enclitic circumflex, by rule xiv.29, under which the same quotation is repeated.

उदात्तसमः शेषः ॥ ४२ ॥

42. The remainder has the same tone with acute.

The plain meaning of this rule is distorted by the commentator, in an attempt to avoid a seeming inconsistency. He claims, namely, that the word "same with" here signifies "a trifle lower than," "because otherwise there would be no circumflex"—the circumflex having been defined in rule 40 as including both the higher and lower tone. But the inconsistency is not evaded by claiming for the last portion of the circumflex any thing short of the actual "grave" tone which rule 40 prescribes: if, indeed, giving to its first portion a higher tone than "acute" be not an equal offense against the same rule.

सव्यञ्जनो ऽपि ॥ ४३ ॥

43. Along with the consonant, too.

Says the commentator—"the rule as formerly given applied to a pure vowel; now the same thing is taught of the circumflexed vowel even in case of its combination with a consonant. The circumflexed vowel along with its consonant, either the one which directly follows an acute or another, is as defined. The 'too' (*api*) continues the implication of the circumflexed vowel." To this explanation of *api*, as simply equivalent with *ca*, we must demur. As any one may see by referring to the various rules in

41. *udāttād anantare yah svarah svaryate tasyā 'dis tāvad uccāstarām udāttatāro bhavati yāvad dhrasvusyā 'rdham. ya-thā: sā-----*

42. *hrasvārdhakālāc chesha udāttasamo bhavati: 'na tā 'dāta eva: samagāḍāprayogāt kiñcin nyanatvam prattiyate: anyathā svaritābhavāt. pūrvoktam evo 'dāharanam.*

(1) W. repeats these clauses in the comment of the preceding rule, after *bhavati*.

which it occurs, it is always best translated by 'even,' as pointing out something which is to a certain degree anomalous, or not to have been naturally expected.

As examples of circumflexed syllables containing consonants, the commentary offers *sākhā sākhībhyo vārivaḥ krnotu* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: all the MSS. except W. give only the second and third words, which are the ones to which the rule applies; the second syllable of each has the enclitic *svārīta*, and they are to be read and divided *sā-khīb-bhyo vā-rī-vaḥ*), and *tiṣhyāḥ* (ii.2.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: but G. M. omit this example).

I have not observed that any other of the treatises deems it necessary to lay down in terms the principle that the consonant shares in the accentuation of the vowel to which it is attached. Though the rule may be regarded as in a manner superfluous, it is less to be objected to in itself than on account of the place where it is thrust in, so wholly out of connection. It ought to be somewhere where it can be made to apply to all the three accents, and not to the circumflex alone.

## अनन्तरो वा नीचैस्तराम् ॥४४॥

44. Or the part following is uttered in a lower tone.

The comment explains *anantara* in this rule as equivalent to *pesha* (in rule 42), and paraphrases by saying that "the remainder of this circumflexed syllable, after the half-mora [of which the character was defined in rule 41] is in a lower tone; that is, is *anudattatara* ('lower than grave')." Whether this is the true meaning, and not rather that the last part of the syllable, instead of being "of the same tone with acute" (rule 42), is "of lower tone (than acute)," may well be made a question. It would be, I should think, an exaggeration of the circumflex of which hardly any theorist would be guilty, to begin it higher than acute, and end it lower than grave. The latter of the two interpretations suggested is also (though not unequivocally) supported by the next rule, which may most naturally be regarded as letting down the concluding tone of the syllable one degree farther than the present rule, as this than the preceding.

43. *kevalasyā 'yam vidhiḥ purastād uktaḥ: idānīm vyañjanasahitātve 'pi 'svaritasya tathātvam ucyate: 'savyañjano 'pi 'svārīta 'udattātād anantaro' 'nyo 'vo 'ktavidhir' bhavati: api-çabdaḥ 'svaritam ākarṣati'. yathā: sakḥā-----: ti-*

(1) W. om. (2) W. -tānant-. (3) W. vā mukhyā vi-. (4) B. om. (5) G. M. -ākar-  
shakah.

44. *tasya svaritasya hrasvārdhakālāc cesho nīcāstarām anudattataro' bhavati: anantaraḥ çesha ity arthaḥ: tad eva 'dāharanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -dattaro.

## अनुदात्तसमो वा ॥ ४५ ॥

45. Or in the same tone with grave.

The commentator does not attempt this time, as under rule 42, to show that "same" means in reality "a little different," but simply paraphrases (taking no account of the *vā*, 'or'): "That same remainder of this circumflexed syllable is the same with *anudatta*."

## आदिरस्योदात्तसमः शेषो ऽनुदात्तसम इत्याचार्याः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Its beginning is the same with acute; its remainder is the same with grave: so say the teachers.

Or, it may be, 'so says the teacher,' the plural being used in token of respect: the word *ācārya* is not elsewhere found in the treatise (save at xxiv.6) except in the expression *ekeshām ācāryāṇām*, 'of certain teachers,' which occurs several times. The commentator does not give us his opinion upon the point, but he declares this to be the only rule that is approved or of force (*iṣṭa*, literally 'desired') in the net-work (*jāla*) of alternative views here adduced, commencing with rule 41. It may, in fact, be looked upon as identical in meaning with the fundamental rule 40, and as presenting the only reasonable and sensible view of the true character belonging to the circumflex accent. The elaboration of the theory of the circumflex, the classification of its varieties, and the determination of their relations to one another, appear to have been quite a favorite weakness with the Hindu phonetists. The subject occupies the whole of one of the later chapters of this treatise (xx.), together with sundry rules in other chapters; and a more detailed examination of it, and criticism of the views taken respecting it, will be necessary in connection with some of those rules.

While approving this rule, for the reason that it is in accordance with the last two rules of chapter xx., which define the relation of

45. *tasya<sup>1</sup> svaritasya sa eva śeṣa anudāttasamo bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

46. *tasyāi<sup>1</sup> 'va svaritasya<sup>2</sup> "dīhrasvārdhakāla udāttasamo bhavati: 'śeṣas tv anudāttasamo bhavati': śeṣas tv anudāttasamā ity ācāryā bruvate. yathā: sakḥ----- tasyā<sup>2</sup> "dīr (i.41) ity ādyabhyāhite<sup>3</sup> 'smin vikalpajāle' sūtram etad eva 'shtam: pra-ṣliṣṭapratihatayor mṛdutarah (xx.11): tādīrovyāñjana-pādavṛttayor (xx.12) iti lakṣhaṇānukūlyāt: na tā<sup>4</sup> paritanam api sūtram iṣṭam: etallakṣhaṇapratikūlyād eva.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. omit, which is better. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *ārabhyā* 'bhikṣite; B. *ābhyahita* (?—correct). <sup>(3)</sup> W. B. -*lpya*- (*lppa*?) ; W. *jāte*.

four of the kinds of circumflex to one another in respect to hardness of utterance, the commentator rejects in advance the next following rule, as being discordant with them. The ground of the asserted accordance and discordance I am not able to discover.

सर्वः प्रवण इत्येके ॥ ४७ ॥

47. It is all a slide, say some.

The commentator says: "The word 'slide' (*pravāṇa*) is a synonym of 'circumflex:' the circumflexed vowel, along with its consonants, starting from its beginning, is all of it a slide: so some teachers have said." And he adds the same example already more than once given, *sākhibhyo vāriṇaḥ* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>). We have seen that, in his exposition of the preceding precept, he has rejected this one, upon grounds of inappreciable value. The view here taken is one that might well enough be held by any one, as virtually equivalent with the one before presented: the voice somehow makes its descent from the higher to the lower pitch within the compass of the accented syllable; whether by a leap or a slide, is a proper theme for hair-splitting argumentation, but of the smallest practical consequence.

नानापदद्विगमसंख्यानि ॥ ४८ ॥

48. A separable word is treated like separate words, except in an enumeration.

The meaning and application of this precept may be best exhibited by means of the examples which the commentator quotes. We have a rule (iv.40) that *te* and *the* at the end of a word of more than two syllables are *pragraha* if preceded by *ā* or *e*. In the passages *ośatāt tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>), then, the final syllables would be *pragraha*, but that the words in which they occur are separable compounds, written in the *pada*-text *tig-ma-hete* and *pra-vāte*, and so are exempted by this rule from the

47. *pravāṇaḥ* *abdaḥ*<sup>1</sup> *svaritaparyāyaḥ*: *savyañjana eva svarita ādita ārabhya sarvaḥ pravāṇo bhavati* 'ty *eka*<sup>2</sup> *ācāryā ācīre. yathā*: *sakh*<sup>3</sup>-----.

<sup>1</sup> B. has *praṇava* for *pravāṇa* everywhere. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> M. *sarvebhyo*.

48. *īngyapadam nānāpadavad bhavati*: *asankhyānavishaye*<sup>1</sup>: *nānāpadavad iti kim*: *oś*-----: *tat*---- *ity ādāv ākārdīkārapūrvas tu bahusvarasya te the* (iv.40) *ity atra*<sup>2</sup> *pragrahatvam mā bhād iti*: *asankhyāna iti kim*: *dve*: *paraś ca*: *ekavyaveto* 'pi (iv.49-51): <sup>3</sup> *dve sav*----- *ity atra pragrahatvam bhavatu*<sup>4</sup> *iti vaddmāḥ. nānāpadam iva nānāpadavat*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ne vish*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *prabhavatu*.

operation of iv.40: the *te* is in each case the ending of a dissyllabic word. What is meant by "enumeration" is not, in itself, very clear, as the case already cited is, in a certain sense, one of enumeration—namely, of the syllables of a word. The commentator shows its intent by pointing out that, by rules iv.49-51, the word *dve*, the next word to it, and the next but one, are made *pragraha*: hence, in the passage *dve savane cukravatī* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), *cukravatī* (*pada*-text *cukra-vatī*) must be counted as a single word only, or the *ī* of *vatī* would not be *pragraha*.

In this, as in the Rik and Atharva Prātiśākhya, the word *īngya* T. W. B. and O. more usually write *īngya*, or *īnya*) means a compound word, treated as separable into its constituents in the *pada*-text. The St. Petersburg lexicon erroneously explains it as signifying a single member of such a compound.

Compare Rik Pr. i.25, and Vāj. Pr. i.153.

तस्य पूर्वपदमवग्रहः ॥४९॥

49. Of such a word, the former member is called *avagraha*.

The example quoted is *devāyata iti deva-yate* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>)—an instance of *carcā*, or repetition with *iti* interposed, such as is usual in the *krama*-texts, and, to a certain extent, in the *pada*-texts also. The existing *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan would write this word simply *deva-yate*, reserving the repetition with *iti* for words which are *pragraha* and separable at the same time: but that of the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā treats all separable compounds in the latter method (see, for the varying usages of different texts, the note to Ath. Pr. iv.74). In *deva-yate*, the part *deva* is denominated *avagraha*. As instance of the use of this technical term is given the rule (iv.2) which exempts all first members of compounds from the action of the rules prescribing *pragraha*.

The commentator, finally, calls attention to the mutual relation, or apposition, of the words *pada* and *avagraha* in the rule, each in its own gender (the former being neuter, the latter masculine): compare under ii.7 and v.2.

The other Prātiśākhya use the term *avagraha* in this sense, but without taking the trouble to define it.

पदग्रहणेषु पदं गम्येत ॥५०॥

50. In citations of a word, that word is to be understood.

That is to say, the cited word itself, and not a part of a word

49. <sup>1</sup>*tasye* <sup>2</sup>*īngyapadasya* <sup>3</sup>*pūrvapadaṁ avagrahaḥ* <sup>4</sup>*ity ucyate. yathā: dev-..... avagrahasamjñāyāḥ* <sup>5</sup>*prayojanam: nā* <sup>6</sup>*'avagrahaḥ* (iv.2) <sup>7</sup>*ity ādi. padāvagrahaḥ* <sup>8</sup>*abdayor niyataliṅgatvānyonyānvayaḥ* <sup>9</sup>*sambhavati.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om. *avagraha*. (<sup>3</sup>) W. *niyama*.

identical in form with it. Thus (to take the commentator's example), *tve* is later (iv.10) declared *pragraha* except at the end of a separable word, as in the passage *tve kratum* (iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>); the exception specified is necessary, because the *tve* of a word like *aditive* (p. *aditi-tve*) is also a *pada* or vocable;—but it is not therefore to be inferred that the *tve* of *kratve*, in the passage *kratve dakshāya* (iii.2.5<sup>2</sup>; 3.11<sup>4</sup>), is also *pragraha*.

As the commentator had formerly derived *grahanam* (i.22) from *grhyate*, so now he derives *grahandni* from *grhñanti*, 'they seize, take.'

The principle here taught is appealed to several times (under iv. 11,38; vii.2) hereafter, in order to the settlement of doubtful points.

It would seem possible to be still made a question whether the citation in any particular rule were a *pada*, 'a full word,' or a *padāikadeça*, 'part of a word,' since citations of the latter kind are also frequently made. Perhaps the commentator would settle the difficulty by asserting that no combination of articulate sounds which actually occurs in the *Sanhitā* as a *pada* is ever cited in any other character.

## अपि विकृतम् ॥ ५१ ॥

51. But that word, even when phonetically altered.

The commentator gives two examples. The word *vāhana*, he says, is cited later (vii.6) as one whose *n* is liable to conversion into *n*: this conversion, then, still holds good, though the final syllable of the word have become *o*: thus, *pravāhano vahniḥ* (i.3.3). Again, *syah*, by v.15, loses its final *visarga*; and it does so, even when its *s* is changed to *sh*, as in *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>). As regards the former of these examples, it might seem to be provided for by rule i.22, above: but the commentator would doubtless plead that the rule would apply to *vāhanah*, but not to *vāhano*.

50. *padagrahaneshu sūtreṣhu grhītam padam eva gamyeta*: <sup>1</sup> *jñātavyam*: *na padāikadeçaḥ*<sup>2</sup>. *yathā*: *tve ity anīṅgyāntaḥ*<sup>3</sup> (iv.10) *iti vakshyati*: *tathā sati tve----* *iti pragraho bhavati*: *kra----* *iti padāikadeçān<sup>4</sup> na bhavati*. *grhñanti*<sup>5</sup> *'ti grahaṇāni*: *padānām grahaṇāni padagrahaṇāni*: *teshu*.

<sup>1</sup> M. ins. *tad*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*gam*. <sup>3</sup> W. *anīṅgy-*; B. *anīṅy-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*çatvān*.

51. *apiçabdaḥ padam anvādiçati*: *padagrahaneshu vikṛtam api padam avagantavyam*. *yathā*: *natvāpattāu vāhana* (vii.6) *iti grahīshyate*: *padam iti kṛtvā visarjanīya otvam āpanne* *'pi natvam nāi* *'va nivartate*: *pra-----*: *eshasasyah* (v.15) *iti visarjanīyalopagrahanam paṭhiṣhyate*: *ay-----* *ity atra sakāre shatvam āpanne* <sup>1</sup> *visargalopo bhavaty eva*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*.

## अप्यकारादि ॥ ५२ ॥

52. And even when preceded by *a*.

The evident occasion of this rule is the frequent occurrence of words with the negative prefix *a* attached to them. But, it being once established, its sphere is not restricted to that class of compounds, as is shown in the very example chosen by the commentator to illustrate its working. By iii.2, *çvā* is included among the words whose final *ā* is liable to be shortened; then, by this rule, *açvā* is also included: e. g. *açvāvantañ* (p. *açva-vantam*) *sa-hasrinam* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>).

Application of this principle is quite frequently made below (under iii.2,8; v.13,16; vi.5,14; viii.8,13; xi.16; xvi.6,19).

## अन्कारादि च ॥ ५३ ॥

53. And when preceded by *an*.

The origin and aim of this rule are obviously the same with those of the preceding, but the instances of its application are less frequent: it is appealed to but three times in the sequel (under rules iii.7, viii.8, and xvi.29). The last case is the one selected by the commentator as his example. The word *añçu*, by xvi.29, contains *anusvāra*; hence the same word preceded by *an* is to be regarded as included with it, as in the passage *anañçu kurvantañ* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator now raises the question: how comes *kāra* to

52. *atrā 'py apiçabdañ padānvādeçakāḥ: padagrahaṇeṣhv akārādy' api' padam vijñeyam: 'çvartāvayunā (iii.2) iti hrasvādeçe vakshyati: akārāder api tasya grahaṇasya hrasva-tvam bhavati. yathā: açv----- akāra ādir yasya tat tathoktam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -diç. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ca. <sup>3</sup> G. M. prefixes the preceding three words of the cited rule.

53. *akārah padam iti bodhayati: padagrahaṇeṣhv ankārādy api padam vijñeyam: añçu (xvi.29) ity anusvārāgame vakshyati: ankārāder api tasyā 'nusvārāgame syāt. yathā: an----- ankāra ādir yasya tat tathoktam.*

*nanv atra sūtre 'n ity asya kārottaratvam katham kriyate: varṇaḥ kārottaraḥ (i.16) iti 'sūtre varṇasya' kārottaratvavi-dhānabhaṅga-prasaṅgat. ucyate: satyam<sup>2</sup> etacchāstrabalan 'na kriyate: kin tu çāstrāntarabalāt<sup>3</sup> kriyate: yathā: pāninīyā 'eva-kāra apikāra' ityādīnān sādhitvam kathayanti: evam atrā 'pi evam aḥkāra āgama (i.23) ity atra<sup>4</sup> codhyaparihārau vijñeyāu.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. *varṇaçabdasya*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tasya*. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. *evakāre 'pi*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *atrā 'pi*.

be added here to the syllable *an*? since offense is thus committed against the precept in rule 16, above, that *kāra* is added to an alphabetic sound to form its name. His answer is: true enough that it is not done by authority of this text-book; but it is done by the authority of other text-books; for example, Pāṇini's followers establish the propriety of such expressions as *evakāra*, *apikāra* (for the words *eva* and *api*). So likewise in this very treatise (in rule 23, above) we have *aḥkāra* for *aḥ*; and the same objection and answer are to be understood as applying there. See the note under rule 16.

एकवर्णः पदमपृक्तः ॥ ५४ ॥

54. A single sound composing a word is called *apṛkta*.

The commentator explains *ekavarṇaḥ* after the fashion usual with him in treating a *karmadhāraya* or determinative compound: "that is both single (*eka*) and a sound (*varṇa*); hence, a single sound." The term *apṛkta* means, he says, 'uncombined with a consonant.' As example of an *apṛkta* word, he quotes *sa uv ekaviṇṣavartaniḥ* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), where *uv* is, by rule ix.16, representative of the particle *u*; and, as counter-example, to illustrate the force of the specification "composing a word," *yajñapatāsv iti* (vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), where *v*, though in a manner isolated, is not *apṛkta*, being only a fragment of a word. Rule ix.16 exemplifies the use of the term.

आद्यन्तवच्च ॥ ५५ ॥

55. And is treated both as initial and as final.

As an instance of the treatment of an *apṛkta* word as initial, the commentary again cites the passage *sa uv ekaviṇṣavartaniḥ* (iv.3.3<sup>2</sup>), and declares that in it is to be seen the effect of rule 41, above (G. M. have here a *lacuna*, and omit the reference to the rule, along with the other instance). This is quite unintelligible to me, since

54. *ekaṣ cā 'sāu varṇac cāi' 'kavarṇaḥ: sa cet padam bhavati so 'pṛktaḥ' syāt. yathā: sa----- padam iti kim: yaj----- samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: ukāro 'pṛktaḥ prakṛtyā' (ix.16) iti. apṛkta iti vyañjanenā 'saṁyuta' ity arthaḥ*

<sup>1</sup> B. ins. *sa*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*ktasaṁjñā*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. add the remaining two words of the cited rule. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*yukta*.

55. *cakārānvādishtāni tad apṛktasaṁjñam padam ādyantavac' ca kāryabhāg bhavati. ādivad yathā: sa---- ity atra 'tasyā' "dir uccāistarām (i.41) iti kāryam bhavati: antavad yathā: o te---- ity atrā' 'ntaḥ (iv.3) iti pragrahakāryam' bhavati. ādiç cā 'ntaṣ cā "dyantāu: tāv ivā "dyantavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ādivad ant*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*ho*.



the rule referred to teaches nothing whatever that is characteristic of an initial sound,—indeed, teaches no *kāryam*, ‘effect,’ at all. For the treatment of such a word as a final, we have as an example the passage *o te yanti* (i.4.33), in which *o* is *pragraha*; with reference to rule iv.3, which teaches that only a final vowel is *pragraha*.

With this rule and the preceding compare Vāj. Pr. i.151-2, which are nearly identical with them in form and meaning. The Rik Pr. does not define the term *aprkta*, but gives respecting it a rule corresponding with the present one. Both give in illustration the same passage, *indre*”’*hi* (*indra*: *ā*: *ihi*), analogous with the one (*bhakshe*”’*hi*. iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>) quoted below, under v.3

## वर्णस्य विकारलोपौ ॥ ५६ ॥

56. Alteration and omission are of a single sound.

That is to say, not of a whole word. Where, as by v.19, more than one letter is omitted, each is specified. The cited examples are, of alteration, *dhūrshāhāu* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>: by rule v.10); of omission, *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>: by rule v.15).

I find this rule expressly appealed to but once in the sequel (under ix.7).

## विनाशो लोपः ॥ ५७ ॥

57. Omission is complete loss.

As example of *lopa*, ‘omission,’ the commentator quotes the passage *sa im’andrā suprayasaḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>1-2</sup>), where the initial *m* of *mandrā* is lost after *im* (by rule v.12: see the note there given). As example of the use of the term, he gives rule v.11, which is introductory to the subject of omissions. He then proceeds to state a very curious reason why such a precept as this should seem called for: “some have maintained the eternity of sound: in order, to the confutation of that doctrine, this rule hath been uttered, in conformity with general grammar.” Pāṇini’s corresponding precept (i.1.60) is *adarganām lopah*, ‘omission is disappearance from view.’

56. *varṇamātrasya vikāralopāu syātām na tu sarvasya padasya. vikāras tāvat: dhā- iti: ‘lopa tu’: sa-....*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. om. B. omits this whole comment, along with the following rule.

57. *varṇavināṣo<sup>1</sup> lopasamjño bhavati. yathā: sa-.... samjñāyāḥ prayojanam: atha lopaḥ* (v.11) *ity ādi. varṇasyā nityatām kecid āhuḥ: tannirākaraṇāya vyākaraṇānusāreṇa sūtram etad abhāni.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *varṇasya v.*

## अन्वादेशो ऽत्यस्य ॥ ५८ ॥

58. Continued implication is of that which was last.

The term *anvādeṣa*, 'after-indication,' with its corresponding verbal forms, and other equivalent expressions (especially *anvākarshaka*, *ākarsaka*, etc.), is constantly employed in the commentary to signify the continued force in a given rule of some specification made in a preceding rule. And the simple meaning of the present precept appears to be, that such a bringing forward is of the predicate last used, the word last cited, or the like. The commentator's first example is entirely accordant with this understanding: in rule vii.3, namely, to the effect that the *n* of *hanyāt* and *upyamānam* is changed to *n̄*, the implication is "after *n̄h̄*," *n̄h̄* being the last mentioned in a list of altering words given in the preceding rule. But he goes on to make another application of the precept: rule xv.8 says "*a*, however, even in *samhitā* [is protracted and nasalized];" and it is to be understood that only a "last" or "final" *a* is intended—as in *suçlokāṅs* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), protracted from *suçloka*; while in *brahmāṣṇ tvañ rājan* (i.8.16<sup>1,2</sup>), *agnāṣṇ ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>), *vicityaḥ somāṣ na vicitryāṣ iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>), where the words protracted are *brahman*, *agne*, *somaḥ*, and *vicitryaḥ*, and the *a* is not a final, there is no nasalization. Evidently, this is a wholly forced and false interpretation: no rule can mean two things so utterly different. Compare the notes to iv.3 and xv.8, where the principle is appealed to.

The comment seeks a kind of support for its double interpretation by calling attention to the distinction between an "affecting cause" (*nimitta*), like the *n̄h̄* brought forward from vii.3 to vii.3 in the first example, and an "affected" word or element (*nimittin*, 'having a cause'), such as is concerned in the second example. The latter (nearly synonymous with *lakshya*, used in the comment to i.22) he defines as "something original (? *pradhāna* seems to be taken here in the sense of *prakṛti*) suffering a prescribed effect."

No one of the other *Prātiçākhyas* attempts to lay down any rules as to the *anvādeṣa* (or *anuvṛtti*); and its usages are, in fact, wholly irreducible to rule—a circumstance which involves the condemnation of the *sūtra* style of composition, because the *sūtras* are not and cannot be self-explanatory, or intelligible without an authoritative comment.

58. *nimittasya nimittino vā 'ntyasyā 'nvādeṣo bhavati: nimitti 'ti pradhānam' kāryabhāg ity yāvat. nimittasya yathā: hanyād upyamānam ca (vii.3) ity asyā 'tra' n̄h̄çabdasya. nimittino yathā: akāras tu sañhitāyām api (xv.8) ity atra suçlokāṅs' ity antyasyā 'kārasya: antyasye 'ti kim: brah-----: ag-----: vic-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -nām; G. M. -na. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om. all the signs of protraction.

## उपबन्धस्तु देशाय नित्यम् ॥ ५१ ॥

59. An *upabandha*, however, is for that particular passage, and of constant effect.

The commentator etymologizes *upabandha*, 'connection, tie,' as representing the meaning *upabadhyate*, 'it is tied up, bound to;' and he farther defines it as signifying a passage pointed out by the indication "in that," and one which is designated by an enumeration—referring to rules iv.22,23,48,52 as examples. An *upabandha*, then, is a connected part of the *Sanhitā*, pointed out and defined by the rules of the *Praticākhyā* in various ways: by citing the first words of a single verse (iv.20) or of an *anuvāka* (iv.25,48; xi.3); by the accepted title of a number of *anuvākas*, either succeeding one another or otherwise (ii.9,11; iv.52; ix.20; xi.3); by giving the first and last words of a passage (iv.22,23); or by fixing a limit within a certain number of words from a specified word (iv.52). Respecting such a passage, we are told, this rule is intended to teach two things: first, that what is prescribed for it does not hold good in other passages—this is signified by the word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule;—second, that an exception which applies in other passages does not apply in it—this is signified by the word *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases.'

Both prescriptions, as thus stated, the commentator undertakes to illustrate by quoted cases of their application. But his first illustration is imperfectly and obscurely set forth, and is, besides, of a very questionable character. He tells us that the passage *ity āha devī hy eśhā devaḥ somah* (vi.1.7<sup>7</sup>) is brought, by the principle laid down in the next rule but one (i.61), under the action of rule iv.25—and this is all that he deigns to say about it. The meaning is this: the passage quoted contains a series of four words, *ity āha devī hi*, which are also found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup> (*devī devaput্রে ity āha devī hy ete devaput্রে*); and, as the *ī* of *devī* in the latter passage is *pragraha* by iv.25, so, under the operation of i.61, it should be *pragraha* also in the other. Such, however, is not the case; for *devī* in *devī hy eśhā* is singular, while in *devī hy ete* it is dual. It would seem, then, as if we ought to understand the commenta-

---

59. *upabandhas tu svadeśāyāi 'va nityam nirdeśako bhavati: upabadhyata' ity upabandhaḥ: etasminn ity<sup>2</sup> adhikaraṇanūprāḥ samkhyānavishayaḥ ca pradeśa upabandha ity ucyate. yathā: irāvati (iv.22) ity ādi sūtradvayam: somāya svai 'tasmin (iv.48): gamayato bhavataḥ (iv.52) iti ca. upabandhe yad uktam tad anyatra na bhavati 'ti tuṣabdārthaḥ<sup>3</sup>. yathā: ity----: atra tripadaprabhṛtinyāyena (i.61) pūrvajeprobhṛty ā'yam (iv.25) iti prāptiḥ. anyatra yo nishedhaḥ sa upabandhe na bhavati 'ti nityaṣabdārthaḥ. yathā: sūdo havirdhāne (iv.11) iti pragraho grahīshyate: kevalahavirdhāna<sup>4</sup> iti sarvathā<sup>5</sup>*

tor to maintain that the present rule annuls the application of i.61, and, through it, of iv.25, to the case in question. But this is wholly inadmissible: for rule 61, below, is directly intended as a limitation to the present one, and has no force or value except as it applies to just such passages as the one here instanced; and with the latter are closely analogous a part of the examples adduced for its illustration, and leading to an opposite conclusion to the one here apparently arrived at. I cannot account for the way in which the commentator treats the matter. So far as I can see, *devī* at vi.1.7<sup>7</sup> is *pragraha* according to the rules of the *Prātiçākhyā*, and has only by some oversight escaped being specially excepted: and the first restriction is of a general character, meaning that directions given for an *upabandha* passage are intended for that passage alone, and have no wider bearing—except as they receive it from i.61. The same, as will be seen below, limits also the other restriction, that expressed by *nityam*.

Further, the citation in rule iv.11 of the compound *sadoha-virdhāne* as *pragraha* implies that the simple word *havirdhāne* would always be of a contrary character, as it in fact is in the passage *havirdhāne khyāyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>); but this implication does not hold in the passage *havirdhāne prāci pravartayeyuḥ* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>), because of the inclusion of the latter among the *upabandhas* of rule iv.52. Here, however, is brought up an objection: the explanation given is not satisfactory, because an exception made elsewhere is sometimes of force also in an *upabandha* passage. For instance, in the passage *atha mithunī bhavataḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>), the word *mithunī*, which would else be *pragraha* by iv.52, is made otherwise by iv.53. Again, an example of a similar class is afforded by *vāyava śrohanavādu* (v.6.21), where *vāyave* ought to be *pragraha*, because occurring in the *anuvāka* to which iv.48 refers, while it is deprived of that character by iv.54. The answer is made, that, in the case of *grāmī*, *vāyave*, *manave*, and the like, the exception must be allowed to have force because those words are excepted by specific mention; while the exception of *havirdhāne* is inferential only, and therefore does not hold good: specific mention being of more force than mere inference.

*na pragraho gṛhyate: yathā: hav-... ity ayam atra<sup>8</sup> nishedhah: hav-... ity atra na prasarati: gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity ādinā prāptiḥ. nanv etad anupapannam: anyatra nishedhasya kvacid upabandhe 'pi darçanāt: yathā: atha-... ity atra gamayato bhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity upabandhaprāptir na grāmī* (iv.53) *ity ādinā 'nyatra<sup>9</sup> nishedhena nishidhyate: tathā<sup>10</sup>: vāy-... ity atra somāya sva* (iv.48) *iti prāptir ate samānapada* (iv.54) *ity anenā 'nyatra nishedhena nishidhyate. atro 'cyate: grāmī vāyave manava ity ādinān kanthoktatvād esha nishedhah prasaratu<sup>11</sup> kevalahavirdhāne<sup>12</sup> pragraho<sup>13</sup> ne 'ty arthiko nishedho na prasaraty eva: arthikakanthoktayolḥ kan-*

But this suggests a further objection: why then is not the specific mention of *ate* and *ave* in rule iv.54 enough, and what is the use of adding the word *nityam*, 'in all cases,' in that rule? This, replies the commentator, is for the purpose of making the exception yet more strongly binding: the specific mention merely annuls the application of the *upabandha* rule; the addition of *nityam* avoids the application of any other rule. For example, in *dve jāye vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>), *vindate* should be *pragraha* (by rule iv.51), because separated by only one word from *dve*; and in *vanaspate vidvāṅgah* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), the same character would belong to *vanaspate* (by iv.38) because followed by *vid*—and we are left to infer that the *nityam* renders rule iv.54 capable of reaching these passages, and taking away the *pragraha* character of the two words in question. This, adds the commentator, may be still further pursued; it has been thus drawn out in accordance with the view of Māhisheya.

In all this exposition is to be seen something of the artificial and hair-splitting character which is apt to belong to a Hindu comment, while upon the whole it is sound and to the point. The term *upabandha* is doubtless better understood actively, as representing *teno 'pabādhyate*, 'that whereby there is binding up:' the presence of *deśāya* in the rule is hardly reconcilable with the other interpretation. The intent of the specification *nityam* is to exclude general exceptions, made in view of other passages, or of the text at large, but not at all to deny the possibility of exceptions made expressly for the *upabandha* passages: and such are iv.53 and others, referred to by the objector, and refuted by an inapplicable special pleading. The force which the commentator ascribes to the *tu* of the rule belongs rather to *deśāya*, and the *tu* has the value of a general disjunctive, bringing in a precept not connected with what has gone before.

Any additional instances of the application of the principles here laid down I have not searched for or chanced upon. The rule is appealed to but once in the sequel (under iv.54).

नानापदीयं च निमित्तं प्रग्रहसादिषु ॥ ६० ॥

60. Also a cause belonging to another word, in the case of a *pragraha* or of a word containing *anusvāra*.

*thoktasya prābalyāt. nanv ate ave* (iv.54) *ity anayoh kanthok-tyādi 'vā 'lam: tatra nityagrahaṇena kim. ucyate: nitarām pari-hārah: kanthoktir upabandhaprāptim eva nivartayati nityaṣa-bdas tu prāptiyantaram api pariharati: yathā: dve---- ity atra ekavyaveto 'pi* (iv.51) *iti prāptih: van----- iti* <sup>14</sup> *vid* (iv.38) *ādiprāptih: evam ādy ūhanīyam*<sup>15</sup>. *māhisheyamatānusārenai 'vam prapañcitam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *upanibadhyata*. <sup>2</sup> W. *itya*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *tu*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kevalam hav-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sarvadhā*. <sup>7</sup> W. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *anyatra*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *ya-thā*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-rati*. <sup>12</sup> B. *kevalam h-*. <sup>13</sup> W. *-he*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *atra*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *-niyamam*.

The intent of this rule is made sufficiently clear by the commentator, but he is unable to show satisfactorily its connection, or the implication in virtue of which it comes to mean what it does. He puts, however, a bold face upon it, and declares that the *ca*, 'also,' implies the negative (*nañ*: compare Pāṇini ii.2.6 etc.) meaning signified by *tu* (that is to say, the *tu* of the preceding rule). This is quite unintelligible. More defensible would be the continuance of *nityam*, 'constantly:' this, indeed, I conceive to be the real interpretation of the *ca*; although the rule is even thus left insufficiently explained by its context. The term *srādishu* points us to the sixteenth chapter, where is to be found an enumeration of all the cases in the *Sanhitā* exhibiting an *anusvāra* which is not a consequence of the phonetic rules of the treatise—of all the words which in their *pada* form contain an *anusvāra*—and this enumeration is led off (xvi.2) with the syllable *sra*. Many of this class of words are pointed out, as elsewhere in the *Prāticākhyā*, by mentioning the words which they precede or follow; which latter, then, become in the view of the treatise their *nimitta*, or 'cause' (taking the *post hoc* or *ante hoc* for a *propter hoc*). Inasmuch, now, as the *pragraha* quality and the occurrence of this *anusvāra* belong to the word itself, independently of its surroundings, it becomes necessary to teach that, when a word has been defined by means of its surroundings as thus characterized, it retains its character even when separated from them, as it is in the *pada*-text. Or, in the language of the rule, the defined occasion of a *pragraha* or of a constituent *anusvāra* is of force, even when it is, or is in, another *pada*.

The commentator, in illustration of the action of the rule, refers us first to iv.28, where *ghñ* and *cakre* are declared *pragraha* when immediately followed by *p*; these words are *pragraha* also in the *pada*-text of the same passages, when there is a pause between them and the *p*. Again, he quotes rule xvi.11, where *mā* is declared to have no *anusvāra* after it when preceded by an *avagraha*; that is, when it begins the second member of a compound, as in *ardhamāse devāḥ* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>): here, too, the precept holds when

60. *cakāras tuṣabdanigaditān<sup>1</sup> nañartham anvādigati: pragraheshu srādishu ca nānāpadasambandhī<sup>2</sup> nimittam asanhitāyām api svakāryam<sup>3</sup> upadigati<sup>4</sup> 'ti pragrahānusvārakāryam<sup>5</sup> na nivartate. yathā: vakshyati: ghñ cakre papare (iv.28) pragrahāu bhavata ity: atra pragrahatve papareno<sup>6</sup> 'padishṭe pada-kāle<sup>7</sup> tathā<sup>8</sup> 'va. srādishu ca<sup>9</sup> yathā: nā<sup>10</sup> 'vagrahapārvaḥ (xvi.11) ity avagraheṇā<sup>11</sup> 'nusvārāgame nishiddhe pada-kāle<sup>12</sup> 'pi tathā<sup>13</sup> 'va: yathā: ardh----- shatvaṇatvādāu<sup>14</sup> 'tu nānāpadīyam<sup>15</sup> nimittam saṁhitāyām eva kāryam karoti<sup>16</sup> 'ty ayam ārambhaḥ: yathā<sup>17</sup>: śuc----- prav-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -bdena nī-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -dha. <sup>3</sup> G. M. svik-. <sup>4</sup> W. -sarak-; B. -hanusvak-.

<sup>5</sup> G. M. pakāreṇa. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. 'pi. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. ca.

<sup>10</sup> G. M. -ya. <sup>11</sup> W. om.

the *avagraha* pause intervenes between the two parts of the compound: as, *ardha-māse*. On the other hand, the cause (*nimitta*) of nasalization of a sibilant or nasal, if in a different *pada* from the letter it affects, is efficient only in *saṃhitā*: for example, *gucishad iti guci-sat* (iv.2.1<sup>5</sup>), and *pravādhana iti pra-vāhanan* (i.3.3): and this is the occasion of the rule.

I see no reason why this rule does not need to apply also to the cases of an original lingual nasal (*n*) enumerated in the thirteenth chapter.

यथोक्तं पुनरुक्तं त्रिपदप्रभृति त्रिपदप्रभृति ॥ ६१ ॥

61. A repeated passage, of three or more words, is as already established.

That is to say, the reading of any connected passage is as established by the rules for the first place where it occurs: if repeated in a later part of the *Sanhitā*, where other rules, there applicable, would change its reading, it is exempted from their influence.

Several examples are given in illustration by the commentator. In the third chapter (*pragṇa*) of the first book (*kāṇḍa*) of the *Sanhitā* occurs the phrase *devasya tvā savituh prasave 'gvinoh* (i.3.1<sup>1</sup>: but the same phrase is found also twice before, at i.1.4<sup>2,6</sup>), and the initial *a* of its last word is cut off by the general rule xi.1; hence, when it occurs again in a *vājapeya* passage (namely at i.7.10<sup>3</sup>), where, by xi.3, the elision of the *a* is forbidden, the effect of the latter rule is suspended, and the passage reads *as* before. Again, the words *supathā rāye asmān* are first found at i.1.14<sup>3</sup>, where, as the *anuvāka* is a *yājyā*, the *a* of *asmān* remains unelided by xi.3; and when they occur again at i.4.43<sup>1</sup>, that letter still maintains its place. Once more, the phrase *sa jāto garbho asi rodasyoh* is read at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, and again at v.1.5<sup>3-4</sup>; the former time in an *ukhya* passage, where the *a* of *asi* is retained by xi.3; and it is therefore retained in the other passage also.

The commentator applies to the rule the restriction that in the repeated passage the word respecting whose form there is question must hold the third place (that is to say, doubtless, that it must have not less than two other words before it). In support of this limitation, he cites a case: at iv.ii.8<sup>3</sup>, in an *ukhya* passage, occur

61. trayāṇām pudānām samāhāras tripadam: kāryabhājah padasya tritīyatvaṃ vijñeyam: idṛṣaṃ tripadam: tat' prabrhty ādir yasya tat' tripadaprabrhtī yathoktam pūrvoktaṃ vidhiṃ karoti svaviṣeṣhaṇam' yatra' tripadaprabrhtī punaruktaṃ cet. tathā: ' lupyate tv akāra ekārāukārapūrvah (xi.1) ity anena prathamakāṇḍatritīyapragṇe dev---- ity atrā 'kāre lupte tad eva vākyaṃ vājapeye 'py alopam bādhitvā tathāi 'va bhavati: tripadaprabrhtitvāt. ubhā vām (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>) ity atra sup---- ity etad ud u tyam jātavedasam (i.4.43<sup>1</sup>) ity atrā 'pi tathāi

the words *prthivīm anu ye antarikshe ye divi tebhyaḥ* (W. B. omit the first two words of the citation), and the *a* of *antarikshe* is left unelided by xi.3; but at iv.5.11<sup>2</sup> (in the last *anuvāka* of the chapter called *rudra*: see rule xi.3) we read *ye prthivyām ye 'ntarikshe ye divi* (W. B., again, omit the first two words quoted, and also give *ye ant*-)—which, but for his restriction, would be a violation of the rule. I cannot but question, however, the right of the commentator thus to limit the rule, for I have noted at least three cases where, if it be admitted, the retention of an initial *a* in a repeated passage would be left without authority: they are *pāvako asmaḥ* (v.4.4<sup>5</sup> and iv.6.1<sup>3,5</sup>), *predhho agne* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>), and *dadhikrāvno akūrisham* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup> and i.v.11<sup>4</sup>). Whether there are other cases like that to which the commentator appeals, I am unable to say: but I cannot help suspecting that he devised this modification of the rule to suit that particular passage, without sufficient regard to what might be required by other parts of the text.

But he is guilty of another piece of arbitrary interpretation which is still more unjustifiable, and which he makes yet lamer work of defending. The term *tripuḍāprabhṛti* means, according to him, a series of words beginning with three words of which the third is the one whose form is in question—that is to say, a series of at least four words, of which one follows the word of doubtful reading. The case to which he appeals to establish this is as follows: the words *divas pari prathamam jāgne agnir asmat* (W. B. omit *asmat*) occur at i.3.14<sup>4</sup>, in a *yājyā* passage, where *agnih* keeps its initial vowel by xi.3; again, the words *itah prathamam jāgne agniḥ* are found at ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>: there seems to be a repetition, and a reading of *agnih* founded upon it; but it is not proper to claim that the retention of *a* here has this ground; it is due to the inclusion (in rule xi.16) of *jāgne* among the words which do not cause the elision: for such inclusion would otherwise be to no purpose (since there is in the *Sanhitā* no other passage to which the prescription should apply). Any other case seeming to require the interpretation here in question I have not noticed; and we have the right to presume that, if the commentator had knowledge of one which supported his view more unequivocally, he would not have failed to refer to it. So far as appears, then, the sole object of this forced

---

'*va.* <sup>5</sup> *saṁ te vāyur* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>) *ity atra sa----* *ity etat krāram* (v.1.5<sup>1</sup>) *ity atrā 'pi tathāi 'va. brāhmaṇavākyeshu tu<sup>6</sup> tri-*  
*padumātrād vā kāryam bhavati: brāhmaṇavākyeshu pūrvastha-*  
*lasyāi<sup>7</sup> 'vo 'kteh<sup>8</sup>: yathā: imām agrbhān raçandm<sup>9</sup>*  
*(iv.1.2<sup>1</sup>) ity atra mar----* *ity etad vākyam<sup>10</sup> ut krāma* (v.1.3<sup>1</sup>)  
*ity atrā 'pi tathāi 'va bhavati. kāryabhājāḥ padasya trtīyatvam*  
*iti kim: prth----- ity <sup>11</sup> ukhye: ye----- iti rudrottamanuvāke.*  
*prabhṛti<sup>12</sup> 'ti kim: tvam agne rudrah* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>) *iti yājyāyām*  
*divas----- iti vākyam agnaye 'nnavate* (ii.2.4<sup>1</sup>) *ity atra*



interpretation of the word *tripadaprabhṛti* (one which the word may be said decidedly not to admit of) is to save rule xi.16 from the charge of repetition in a single point: we shall presume with much greater plausibility that, when the rule was made, the fact that this particular case was already covered by i.61 was overlooked.

But the commentator virtually admits the unsoundness of his own work by acknowledging that in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages (*brāhmaṇavākya*) of the *Sanhitā* a simple phrase of three words is enough to justify the application of the rule, "because," he says, "of the quotation in the *brāhmaṇa*-passages of a previously-occurring phrase:" that is to say, because the prose part of the *Sanhitā* is to so great an extent occupied with citing and commenting on the phrases and words of other parts—a fact which has, doubtless, been the special occasion and suggestion of the present rule. Thus, the words *maryaṣṛi sprhayad varṇo agniḥ* are quoted at v.i.3<sup>3</sup> (with the customary addition, *ity āha*), from the previous passage iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>; and although the *nābhim* which follows *agniḥ* at its first occurrence is not also quoted, and the quotation is not therefore a *tripadaprabhṛti* according to the commentator's construction of this term, the rule holds good, and the *a* of *agniḥ* has a right to stand.

The general value of this rule is that of a limitation to the last but one; it points out a class of cases in which a rule given for a particular passage is not limited to that passage, but also acts elsewhere; in which, moreover, such a rule does not govern *nityam*, 'against all opposition,' the reading of the passage to which it relates.

The commentator notices the fact that the repetition of the final word of the rule indicates the conclusion of the chapter. Such repetition is made at the end of each chapter, and by all the manuscripts; and, as it is thus farther ratified by the comment, I have not hesitated to admit it as an authentic part of the text of the *Prātiçākhyā*. G. M. repeat the whole rule in this case.

*itah--- iti punaruktam: tat<sup>12</sup> tathāi 'vā 'bharud<sup>13</sup> iti cet: mādī  
'vam: tripadamātrād<sup>14</sup> eva tathābhāva<sup>15</sup> iti<sup>16</sup> vaktum nu yuktam:  
kim tu jajñe sañsphānaḥ (xi.16) iti jajñegrahaṇasāmarthyāt:  
<sup>17</sup>anyathā tasya<sup>18</sup> vāiyarthya<sup>17</sup>.*

*padavīpsā<sup>19</sup> 'dhyāyaparisamāptim dyotayati.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarāṇe  
prathamō 'dhyāyāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -ndya; G. M. -shena. <sup>3</sup> G. M. idam. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. hi. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. tathā. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. pūrvasyādi. <sup>8</sup> G. M. 'klah. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. ebhya. <sup>12</sup> G. M. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. syād. <sup>14</sup> G. M. tripadād. <sup>15</sup> G. M. tathā bhavatu. <sup>16</sup> G. M. ins. atra. <sup>(17)</sup> W. om. <sup>18</sup> G. M. tasyādi 'va. <sup>19</sup> G. M. padāvṛtthyā.

## CHAPTER II.

CONTENTS: 1-11, general mode of production of articulate sounds, distinction of sord and sonant sounds, etc.; 12-29, special rules for the production of vowels and diphthongs; 30, nasals; 31-34, difference of vowels and consonants; 35-39, mode of production of mutes; 40-43, of semivowels; 44-45, of spirants; 46-48, of *h* and *ḥ*; 49-52, of nasal sounds.

## अथ शब्दोत्पत्तिः ॥ १ ॥

## 1. Now for the origin of sound.

For the word *atha* in this rule the commentator allows us our choice between two interpretations: it either indicates immediate succession—thus, the list of articulate sounds having been given, there next arises the desire to know what is the cause of these sounds, or how they become apprehensible by the sense, and then follows the explanation here to be given—or it is introductory, signifying that from this point onward the subject of the origin of sound is the one had in hand. Compare the similar and yet more lengthy discussion under rule i.1. He then goes on to draw out the significance of the rule itself. *Ṣabda* he explains by *dhvani*: both, when used thus distinctively, mean audible sound in general, rather than articulate sound or voice (compare xxii.1,2; xxiii.3). He paraphrases: “of the articulate sounds, *a* etc., the cause of perception, or their origin, their birth, their apprehension by the sense—just as, even before water is seen, there is moisture in the ground, and that becomes visible in consequence of digging—this is the subject of description.” We seem to catch here a glimpse of that same doctrine of the eternity of sound to which reference was made above, under i.57: our organs do not properly produce it, but their action brings it to the cognizance of the senses, as the action of digging brings water to light.

1. *ukto varṇasamāmnāyaḥ: teshām varṇānām kīdrk' kāra-  
nam<sup>2</sup> katham vā tadupalabdhīr ity ākāṅkṣhānantaram<sup>3</sup> nirāpyata  
ity ānantaryārtho 'thaṣabdaḥ. atha vā: ita uttarām yad vaksh-  
yate tac chabdotpattir ity etad<sup>4</sup> adhikṛtam veditavyam ity adhikā-  
rārthaḥ. ṣabdo nāma dhvaniḥ: varṇānām akārādīnām upādā-  
nakāraṇam<sup>5</sup> tadutpattir<sup>6</sup> janma upalabdhīr vā: yatho 'dakasya  
'darṣanāt pūrvam eva bhūmadu jalam asty eva tat khaṇanād<sup>7</sup> dr̥ṣy-  
ate tadvat<sup>8</sup>: se 'yam ucyate<sup>9</sup> iti sūtrārthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kīdr̥ṣam*. <sup>2</sup> W. *karāṇam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *tan*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> B. -*karāṇam*.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. *taṣya ut*. <sup>(7)</sup> W. B. om. <sup>8</sup> MSS. *khaṇanā*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *ārābhyata*.

## वायुशरीरसमीरणात्कण्ठोरसोः संधाने ॥ २ ॥

2. By the setting in motion of air by the body, at the junction of throat and breast.

The first part of this rule (literally, 'from air-body-impulsion') is obscurely expressed, and of ambiguous meaning. The commentator gives three explanations of it, the first of which is also itself obscure. Agni ('fire, warmth'—'heat of the body?'), he says, impels Vāyu ('air, wind'); that is what "air-body" means (but how?). From such an impulsion—that is to say, expulsion, effort at utterance—at the junction of, or between, throat and breast, comes the origination of sound. And he quotes a verse from the Çikshā (verses 8-9 of the Yajus version, verses 6-7 of the Rik version: see Weber's Ind. Stud., iv.350-1): "the mind impels the body-fire; that sets in motion air; and air, moving in the breast, generates a gentle tone." Again (or rather, apparently, as a part of the same explanation: but its inconsistency with the rest is palpable), he makes a copulative compound of *vāyu-ṣarīra*, namely 'air-and-body': "from the impulsion of those two." Once more, he quotes as the opinion of other authorities that *vāyu-ṣarīra* means 'the air in the body,' the compound being of such a sort that that which should be its first member is put last, after the analogy of *rājadanta*, 'upper incisor' (literally, 'king-tooth'—that is, as the Hindu etymologists explain it, 'tooth-king, chief among the teeth'), and the other words composing that *gaṇa* (to Pāṇ. ii.2.31). And he adds the remark that, in this interpretation, the air is understood as the cause of the impulsion, not its product.

In the translation of the rule given above, the primary division of the compound is regarded as to be made after *vāyu*; *ṣarīra-samīraṇa* meaning an 'impulsion by the body,' and *vāyu* being prefixed in a genitive relation, 'of the air.' This is harsh, but appears to me more acceptable and less violent than the other constructions proposed. Practically, the point is of small consequence.

2: *vāyurṃ agniḥ samīrayati 'ti vāyuṣarīram: tathābhātāt samīraṇāt: prerandābhighātāt' ity arthah: kanthorasoh sandhāne madhyadeṣe gabbdotpattir bhavati 'ti': cikshā cāi 'vam asti 'ti':*

*manah kāyāgnim<sup>1</sup> dhanti<sup>2</sup> sa<sup>3</sup> prerayati mārutam<sup>4</sup>:*

*mārutas tū 'rasi caran mandraṃ janayati 'svaram*

*iti<sup>5</sup>. vāyuṣ ca ṣarīram ca vāyuṣarīre: tayoh samīraṇam: tasmāt<sup>6</sup>. anye tv āhuḥ: vāyoh ṣarīre sataḥ samīraṇam: <sup>7</sup>tasmāḥ chabdotpattir iti: tatre<sup>8</sup> 'ttham samāsaḥ: rājadantādītvāc charīrasya<sup>9</sup> paraniṣātaḥ: ṣarīre vāyur<sup>10</sup> vāyuṣarīram: tasya samīraṇam<sup>11</sup>: tasmāt. asmin mate vāyoh samīraṇakartṛtvam eva na tu karma-tvam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *abhipā-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-gni.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. *kānti.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sam.* <sup>7</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>9</sup> G. M. *ins. vāyuṣarīrasamīraṇāt.* <sup>10</sup> B. *om.* <sup>11</sup> G. M. *ātre.* <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-raçabbdasya.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. *om.*

Compare with what is taught by our treatise here and later (xxii.1,2; xxiii.1-3) Vāj. Pr. i.6-9; Rik Pr. xiii.1.

तस्य प्रातिश्रुत्कानि भवत्युरः कण्ठः शिरो मुखं  
नासिके इति ॥ ३ ॥

- 3. The parts which give it audible quality are breast, throat, head, mouth, and nostrils.

The commentator explains *prāṭicrūtāni* as signifying 'the places of production' (*sthānāni*), having to do with the resonance (*prāṭicrūt=pratidhvani*, 'resonance'), of the aforesaid sound (*śabda*). He offers no remark upon the organs enumerated, but leaves their various offices to be derived from the rules which follow. But, in anticipation of the next three rules, he observes that they teach the three-fold quality of sound, as sonant, surd, and *h*-sound, rule 4 giving the definition of the first kind.

The *Ōikshā* (v.13: Weber's Ind. Stud. iv.351) makes an enumeration of eight *sthānas*, or places of production of articulate sounds, dividing the "mouth" of our list into root of the tongue, teeth, lips, and palate.

संवृते कण्ठे नादः क्रियते ॥ ४ ॥

4. When the throat is closed, tone is produced.

The commentator treats this rule as a definition of the technical term *nāda*, 'tone,' and cites rule 8, below, as an example of the use of the term.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.1) gives a corresponding definition of sonant utterance, but specifies the aperture (*kha*) of the throat as the part whose contraction or closure produces the tone. Compare also Vāj. Pr. i.11. It is greatly to the credit of the ancient Hindu phonetists that they had gained by acute observation so clear an idea of the manner in which the intonation of the breath is effected in the throat; but precisely how accurate a knowledge

3. *tasya prakṛtasya<sup>1</sup> śabdasyo 'raḥprabhṛtīni sthānāni<sup>2</sup>. bhavanti: prāṭicrūt<sup>3</sup> pratidhvaniḥ: 'tatsambandhīni prāṭicrūtāni<sup>4</sup>. 'saṁvṛte kaṇṭhe nādaḥ kriyate* (ii.4) *etadādinā sūtratrāyaṇa śabdātṛāividhyam<sup>5</sup> ucyate: nādaḥ<sup>6</sup> śvāso hakaṛaś ce 'ti: tāvaṁ nādalakṣaṇam āha<sup>7</sup> '.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *prakṛti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *prāṭicrūtāni*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-crūtā*. <sup>4</sup> W. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. insert this (excepting the rule) at the beginning of the commentary to the next rule. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *śabdasya tr-*. <sup>7</sup> MSS. *nāda*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ucyate*.

4. *saṁvṛte kaṇṭhe yaḥ śabdaḥ kriyate sa nādasamjño bhavati. samjñāyāḥ<sup>1</sup> prayojanam: nādo 'nupradānam* (ii.8) *iti<sup>2</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nādasam-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ity ādi*.

they had of the nature and action of the vocal chords, whose tension produces the closure, we, of course, cannot say.

विवृते श्वासः ॥ ५ ॥

5. When it is opened, breath is produced.

The explanation given of this rule corresponds with that of the preceding, and the rule cited for the use of the term *śvāsa*, 'breath,' is ii.10.

मध्ये रुकारः ॥ ६ ॥

6. When in an intermediate condition, the *h*-sound is produced.

*Madhye* is explained as meaning 'in a method intermediate between closed and opened:' the rest of the comment agrees with the two preceding, and the cited rule is ii.9.

Of the other *Prātiśākhya*s, only that of the *Rig-Veda* sets up a third kind of articulated material, besides tone and breath; and that (xiii.2) derives the material from a combination of the two others, rather than their mean. I have already (note to *Ath. Pr.* i.13) expressed my opinion that the attempt to establish this distinction is forced and futile, and I see at present no reason for changing it. That intonated and unintonated breath should be emitted from the same throat at once is physically impossible. In loud stridulous whispering, there is a tension of the vocal chords only short of that which gives rise to sonant vibration; and if any one chooses to claim that the aspirations used in loud speaking partake of such a character, sometimes or always, we need not be at the pains to contradict him.

ता वर्णप्रकृतयः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Those are the materials of alphabetic sounds.

That is to say, the three kinds of material just described—tone, breath, and *h*-sound, some letters having one of these as the material out of which they are made, and others another. Just so, it is added, jars and dishes have clay for their material, and thread is the material of cloth.

The commentator then goes on to raise and answer a grammatical objection to the form of the rule. Since it is the office of a

5. *vivṛte kanthe yaḥ śabdaḥ kriyate sa śvāsasaṁjño bhavati. saṁjñādyāḥ prayojanam: aghośheshu śvāsaḥ* (ii.10) *iti.*

6. *saṁvṛtavivṛtayor madhye madhyaprakāre yaḥ śabdaḥ kriyate sa hākārasaṁjño bhavati. saṁjñādyāḥ prayojanam: hākāro hacaturtheshu* (ii.9) *iti.*

pronoun to call to mind things already mentioned, and the words *nāda*, *svāsa*, and *hakāra*, which are referred to by the pronoun in this rule, are masculine, why is the pronoun feminine (*tāh*, instead of *te*)? The reply is: "by the *dictum* of the Mahābhāshya, 'pronouns effecting the equivalence of the thing pointed at and of that which is pointed out respecting it assume at pleasure the gender of either of the two,' is established the propriety of the form used in the rule; therefore there takes place a mutual accordance, or apposition." The passage referred to is apparently that found, not in the Mahābhāshya itself, but in Kaiyāṭa's Mahābhāshya-pradīpa, nearly at the beginning of the work (I owe this reference to the kindness of Prof. Goldstücker): in Ballantyne's edition (p. 7) it reads, with several variations from the text given by our commentator, *uddiçyamānapratinirdiçyamānayoṛ ekatvam āpādayanti sarvanāmāni puryāyeṇa taliṅgam upādadata iti*. Reference is again made to this passage for a similar purpose under v.2.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.2) has this rule also, in nearly identical form.

## नादो ऽनुप्रदानः स्वरघोषवत्सु ॥ ८ ॥

8. In vowels and sonant consonants, the emission is sound.

The term *anupradāna* is etymologized as representing *anupradīyate* 'nena varṇaḥ', 'therewith is given forth an articulate sound;' and *anupradīyate* is farther explained by *upādīyate*, 'is obtained,' and *janyate*, 'is generated.' As synonym for the same term is given *mālakārana*, 'radical cause.'

I have already (note to Ath. Pr. i.13) called attention to the praiseworthy unanimity with which the Hindu phonetists define

7. *varṇānām prakṛtayo varṇaprakṛtayaḥ: tā varṇaprakṛtayo bhavanti ye nādaçvāsaḥakāraḥ uktāḥ: nādaprakṛtayaḥ kecid varṇāḥ: svāsaprakṛtayo 'nye: hakāraprakṛtayo 'nye: yathā mṛtprakṛtayo ghaṭaçarāvādayaḥ: yathā vā tantuprakṛtayaḥ patāḥ. nanu sarvanāmnaḥ prakṛtaparāmargitvān<sup>1</sup> nādaçvāsaḥakāreṣhu punḥliṅgeṣhu<sup>2</sup> satsu tā iti striliṅgaprayogaḥ kathanān sādhuḥ. ucyate: nirdiçyamānapratinirdiçyamānayoṛ<sup>3</sup> ekatām āpādayanti sarvanāmāni kāmācāreṇa taliṅgam<sup>4</sup> upādadata iti mahābhāshya-vacanāt prayogaśādhutvam adhyavastīyate: tasmād anyonyānvāyaḥ<sup>5</sup> sambhavatī<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*ṛçakatv-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *parāmārçarheṣhu*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*prakṛti-nird-*. <sup>5</sup> W. -*ṅgatām*; G. M. *tattall-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*yasambhavaḥ*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om.

8. *svareṣhu ghoshavatsv ca<sup>1</sup> varṇeṣhu nādo 'nupradānam bhavati: anupradīyate 'nena varṇa<sup>2</sup> ity anupradānam mālakāranam: anupradīyata upādīyate janyata ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -*ṇā*.

the true ground of the distinction between surd and sonant letters. European phonetists, after long perplexing the subject with such false distinctions as are expressed by the terms "soft" and "hard," "weak" and "strong," and the like, seem now at last to be coming to a universal accordance in the correct view.

## हकारो हचतुर्थेषु ॥ ९ ॥

9 In *h* and in sonant aspirate mutes, it is *h*-sound.

For the quality of this *h*-sound, see rule 6, above. The Rik Pr. (xiii.2,5: rules 6,17) connects in the same manner *h* and the "fourth" mutes. Our treatise evidently regards the peculiar *h*-sound belonging to the sonant aspirates not as something that follows the breach of contact, but as inhering in the letter, in the same manner as tone in the simple sonants. Whether the Rik Pr. hints at a difference of opinion on this point may be made a matter of question. But the failure on the part of the Prâtigākhyas to recognize the essentially compound character of the aspirate mutes, the fact that these differ from the unaspirated mutes by interposing something between the mute and the following vowel, is one of their marked weaknesses.

The commentator enters into no labored exposition of the rule, but spends his strength, rather, in defending its situation. He first suggests the objection that it is not in proper place, as offending against the order observed in the definition of the three kinds of material (the *h*-sound is defined last, and we should therefore expect the letters containing it to be specified last); but claims in reply that it is, after all, in place, being intended to obviate an undue extension of the preceding rule, which would otherwise be liable to be made, since *h* and the "fourth" mutes are included (by i.13,14) among the sonant consonants, to which that rule applies.

## अघोषेषु श्वासः ॥ १० ॥

10. In surd consonants, it is breath.

Which are the surd consonants, was taught us in rule i.12.

9. *hakāraḥ*<sup>1</sup> ca caturthāḥ ca hacaturthāḥ: teshu varṇeshu<sup>2</sup> *hakāro* 'nupradānam bhavati. nanu sañjñāvidhānakramabhaṅga-prasaṅgān<sup>3</sup> nā 'tre 'daṁ sūtram avatarati. ghoshavatsv iti sāmānyān nādo hacaturtheshu ca<sup>4</sup> *prasajyata*<sup>5</sup> ity atiprasaṅgaparihārārthatvād avataraty eve 'ti vadāmaḥ<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. haḥ. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. B. -bhaṅgān. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -jyeta. <sup>6</sup> G. M. vādāḥ.

10. *aghosheshu varṇeshu śvāso* 'nupradānam bhavati'.

<sup>1</sup> B. omits rule and comment.

## भूयान्प्रथमेभ्यो ऽन्येषु ॥ ११ ॥

11. And more of it in the other surd letters than in the simple surd mutes.

Here *śvāsa*, 'breath,' is continued by implication from the preceding rule "in virtue of vicinage" (*sāmīdhyāt*), as the Commentator says (there being no *ca*, 'and,' in the rule, to indicate it directly). The other surd letters are the surd aspirate mutes and the spirants (excepting *h*). There is no separation made of these two classes upon the important ground that in the spirants the greater expenditure of breath inheres in the whole character of the sound, as being fricative, while in the aspirate mutes it consists in a brief emission between the explosion of the contact and the following vowel.

The Rik Pr. (xiii.6: rule 19) says "some regard the breath in the aspirates as quicker"—an ambiguously indefinite expression.

## अवर्णे नात्युपसंस्कृतमोष्ठकृन् नतिव्यस्तम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. In forming the *a*-vowels, the lips and jaws must not be too nearly approximated, nor too widely separated.

The plain intent of this rule appears to be to guard against an excess either of openness or of closeness in the utterance of *a* and *ā*, while at the same time these two sounds are considered as alike in quality. Such is not, however, the understanding of the commentator; he declares it impossible to follow both directions in forming one sound, and directs that a division be made: excessive approximation is to be avoided in the case of *a*, and excessive separation in those of the long *ā* and protracted *ās*. If his intention had been to recognize the same difference in quality between *a* and *ā* which is taught by the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. and by Pāṇini (see note to Ath. Pr. i.36), he would have been likely to apply the two directions of the rule in a contrary manner, warning against over-openness in *a* and over-closeness in *ā*.

11. *sāmīdhyāc chvāsa iti labhyate: prathamēbhya 'nyeshv. aghosheshu śvāso<sup>1</sup> bhūyān adhiko bhavati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

12. *avarṇa uccāryamāṇa oṣṭhahanaṁ atyupasaṁhṛtam atisaṁślisṭam na bhavati: ativyastam ativivṛtam 'ca na' bhavati. oṣṭhāu ca hanā c' oṣṭhahana: dvandvaś ca prānītūryasendāṅgānām (Pāṇ. ii.4.2) ity ekavadbhāvaḥ: tad etad<sup>2</sup> ekasminn ubhayathā na śakyate kartum iti yogavibhāgaḥ kāryaḥ<sup>3</sup>: akāre nā<sup>4</sup> 'tyupasaṁhṛtam akāre ca<sup>5</sup> plute ca nā<sup>6</sup> 'tivyastam iti.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. na ca. (<sup>2</sup>) W. eva tad; G. M. om. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. B. om. (<sup>4</sup>) W. G. ṇā. (<sup>5</sup>) W. B. om.



The term *oshthaharu*, though singular, is declared to signify the two lips and the two jaws, and a rule of Pāṇini (ii.4.2) is quoted in justification of such treatment of a copulative compound.

ओकारे च ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in uttering *o*.

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule, we are told, brings forward only the action of the jaws prescribed in the preceding rule: this appears from the fact that the one following gives a special direction with regard to the action of the lips. In forming an *o*, then, the jaws are not to be too widely separated.

ओष्ठौ तूपसङ्कतरौ ॥ १४ ॥

14. But the lips are more nearly approximated.

"Vicinage" is here again made the sufficiently obvious ground of assuming that the direction applies to the utterance of *o*. The "but" (*tu*) of the rule, according to Vararuci, one of the three authorities from whom our comment is principally derived (see the introduction), annuls the direction formerly (in rule 12) given as to the position of the lips: but Māhisheya, another of the same authorities, has explained it as exempting from the widely separated condition the *o* of such words as *bandhoh* (ii.5.8<sup>7</sup>). This latter interpretation is quite absurd, or else I am very obtuse with regard to it.

As regards the precise tone of the *o*, such directions as these can teach us nothing satisfactory. The only valuable conclusion which we derive from them is that the authors of the *Prāticākhya* looked upon the sound as a simple homogeneous tone—not phonetically diphthongal, although in classification excluded (by rule i.2) from the category of simple vowels. The same, we shall see, is the case with *e* also.

इषत्प्रकृष्टावेकारे ॥ १५ ॥

15. In uttering *e*, they are slightly protracted.

13. *ca*kāro hanumātrakāryānvādeśakah: *oshthukāryasya parasūtreṇa viśeṣavidhānāt*. *okāra uccāryamāṇe hanu ativyaste na bhavataḥ*.

14. *sāmīdhyād okāra iti labhyate: okāre kārya osthāv<sup>1</sup> upasamhrtatarau syātām: tuṣabḍa osthayoh pūrvoktavidhīm nivārayati<sup>2</sup> ti vararucir uvāca. māhisheyas tu bahāshe: bandhor ity ādikam okāram savyaṅjanam<sup>3</sup> vijastato<sup>4</sup> nivārayati<sup>2</sup> ti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. vār. <sup>3</sup> G. M. vyañj-. <sup>4</sup> W. vjes-.

That "they" means the lips is, we are told, sufficiently indicated by the dual number of the adjective. *Prakṛṣhta*, 'protracted,' is glossed by *sānnikṛṣhta*, 'drawn down together, brought near.'

उपसङ्गतरे कनू ॥ १६ ॥

16. The jaws are more nearly approached.

The force of the comparative is explained by the usual term *atiṣayena*, 'with excess.'

In the utterance of *e*, the position of the tongue is also a matter of importance, and is explained in the next rule.

निक्लामध्यान्ताभ्यां चोत्तराङ्गम्यात्स्पर्शयति ॥ १७ ॥

17. And one touches the borders of the upper back jaws with the edges of the middle of the tongue.

The "and" (*ca*) in this rule we are directed to regard as bringing forward the *ekāra* of rule 15, "on the frog-leap principle"—that is to say, by overleaping the intervening rule. The terms descriptive of the organs concerned I have translated in accordance with the directions of the commentator, although much tempted to render *jambhyan* by 'jaw-teeth, grinders.' I cannot doubt that *jambhyan* is the true reading here, although the MSS. give a curious and perplexing variety of forms to the word, and *uttarāṇ jambhyan* is not once read: T. comes nearest to it, giving *uttarāṇ jambhyan*; W. has *uttarā jambhyan* in the rule, and *uttarā jambhyan* and *jambhyan* in the comment; B., *uttarāṇ jambhyan* in the rule, *uttarā jambhyan* and *jambhyan* in the comment; G. and M., *uttarāṇ jambhyan* in the rule; G., *uttarāṇ jambhyan* and *jambhyan*; and M., *uttarāṇ jambhyan* and *jambhyan*, in the comment. The verb *sparṣayati* is equivalent to *spṛṣet*, the causative ending *nic* being added without altering the meaning of the simple verb (compare Pāṇ. iii.1.25), as in *pālay* for *pā*, and other like cases.

15. *prakṛṣhtāv ity utra dvivacanena prakṛtāv oṣṭhāu grhyete: ekāre kārya oṣṭhāu iṣhatprakṛṣhtāu syātām. prakṛṣhtatā sānnikṛṣhtatā.*

16. *sānnidhyād ekāra iti labhyate: ekāre kārye hanū upasamhṛtatare bhavataḥ. atiṣayeno 'pasamhṛte upasamhṛtatare.*

17. *ekāre kārye jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām uttarāṇ jambhyan sparṣayati spṛṣed ity arthaḥ: pālayati 'ty ādivat svārthe nic: jambhyan iti hanāmūlaprāntadegān' ity arthaḥ: mandūkaphutinyāyena' cakāra ekāram ākarṣatī. jīhvāyā 'madhyām jīhvāmadhyam: tasyā 'ntāu': tābhyām jīhvāmadhyāntābhyām.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pālay*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-cam*; W. *-ntaprade*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-kagatiny*. <sup>4</sup> W. *ma-ūhya antāu*; B. *madhyasya anān*.

In order to complete the definition of the mode of production of *e*, rules 20 and 23, below, have yet to be applied; but they add nothing essential to the description of the present rule, which assures to the vowel, as clearly as any such description could do, the "continental" sound of *e*, or that which it has in *they*, short in *met*. There is no hint of a composite or diphthongal utterance, any more than in the case of *o*. A diphthongal utterance, however, as *ai*, *au* (in *aisle*, *house*), we must assume them to have had originally (compare note to Ath. Pr. i.40).

उपसंस्कृतरे च जिह्वाग्रमृकार्कारल्कारेषु बर्त्से-  
पूपसंस्करति ॥ १८ ॥

18. The jaws, also, are more closely approximated, and the tip of the tongue is brought into close proximity to the upper back gums, in *r*, *ṛ*, and *ḷ*.

The construction of this rule is very harsh; the subject *hanu*, 'jaws,' comes into its first member again with a flying leap from rule 16, drawn by the *ca*, 'also;' while the second member starts off independently, "one approximates," with no connective to bind it to the other. These roughnesses are unremarked by the commentator, and I have smoothed them over in the translation. The word *upasaṁharati*, 'approximates,' is glossed in the comment by *nikshipet*, 'let one throw down (or apply),' and *barsvās* is explained as 'the high places behind the row of teeth'—that is, the swelling of the inner gums.

The commentator starts a question as to the propriety of the conversion of *ṛ* and *ḷ* in this rule into *r* and *l* after *a* (*ṛkāraṛkā-ralkāra*, from *ṛkāra-ṛkāra-lkāra*), the cases not being covered by the prescription given below (at x.8: no case of the combination of *ṛ* and *ḷ* occurring in the *Sanhitā*, the *Prâtigāhya* makes no provision for it): he is compelled to acknowledge that this treatise does not teach the conversion, but claims that it is justified by the authority of other text-books; and that the same explanation applies to an earlier case (rule i.31) of a like combination.

This wholly insufficient direction is all that our treatise gives

18. *caṣabdo hanvor<sup>1</sup> anvādeṣakah: ṛkāra ṛkāra ḷkāre ca kārye hanu<sup>2</sup> upasaṁhrtatare bhavataḥ: jihvāgrāṁ ca barsveshū<sup>3</sup> pasamharati nikshipet: barsveshū iti dantapaṅkter upariśṭād uccapradeśeshū ity arthaḥ. nanv aram ṛkārapare (x.8) iti lakṣaṇā-sambhavad<sup>4</sup> ṛkāraṛkāraḷkāreṣū iti katham samdhiḥ sādhuḥ. satyam nāi<sup>5</sup> tallakṣaṇāt: kim tu gāstrāntarūbalāt<sup>6</sup>: evam ṛkāra-lkāraḷau hrasvāv (i.31) iti vijñeyam<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *hanvār*; B. *h*; G. M. *hanor*. <sup>2</sup> W. *om*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-ṇas-*; B. *-ṇasuniṇāvāddād*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ins. sādhuḥ*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.

us for the utterance of the difficult *r* and *l* vowels. By i.2, they are excluded from the category of simple homogeneous vowels. For the teachings of the other Prāṭiśākhyas respecting them, see note to Ath. Pr. i.37. However they may have been pronounced at the period of grammatical treatment of the Vedic texts, we have no good reason to doubt that, at the time when those texts were composed, they were phonetically the same with the semi vowels *r* and *l*, differing from them only as, for example, the *l* of *able* differs from that of *ably*, the *r* of (French) *aigre* from that of *aigri*. For a theoretical discussion of this double value of the articulated sounds which lie nearly upon the boundary line between vowels and consonants, see Journ. Am. Or. Soc. viii.362 seq.

### एकेषामनुस्वारस्वरभक्तयोश्च ॥ ११ ॥

19. As, also, according to some, in *anusvāra* and *svara-bhakti*.

In this case, we are told, the "also" (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding rule, and the meaning is, that there is approximation of the jaws in uttering *anusvāra*, and approach of the tip of the tongue to the gums in uttering the *svarabhakti*, according to the opinion of some; while others hold that *anusvāra* is simply nasal, and the *svarabhakti* (see xxi.15) equivalent to *r*. This, the commentator adds, is Vararuci's explanation, and its truth is questionable. We, in our turn, may regard it as matter for question whether this attribution and expression of doubt apply to the whole interpretation of the rule, or only to its concluding part, the statement of the opinion of "others." The latter is perhaps most probable.

So far as regards *anusvāra*, we can hardly ascribe any value or propriety to this rule; the definition of *svarabhakti* in connection with that of the *r*-vowels is natural enough.

### अनादेशे प्रणयस्ता जिह्वा ॥ २० ॥

20. In the absence of special direction, the tongue is thrust down forward.

When no such direction as "with the point of the tongue," "with

---

19. *ca*kārah pārvoktavidhim anvādicati: yathāsamkhyenā<sup>1</sup> 'nusvārasvarabhaktiyoḥ pārvoktavidhir bhavati: anusvāre hanvōr upasamhārah: svarabhaktāu jihvāgrasya barsveshū<sup>2</sup> 'pasamhārah: etad ekeshām matam. anyeshām tu matam anusvārasya<sup>3</sup> 'nand-sikamātratvam: svarabhakter rkāratulyatvam. iti vararucimātam<sup>3</sup>: tac cintyam<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -khyo. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -ciracitam. <sup>3</sup> W. cītyam; B. cānityam.

the middle of the tongue" is given, then its position is to be understood as here directed. To explain *pranyastā*, the commentator gives, besides an ordinary analysis, the expression "in a quiescent state;" as example, he cites *upa mā* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>: G. and M. spoil the citation by adding the following word, *dyāvāprthivī*), in the utterance of which words the tongue is not called perceptibly into action. But this interpretation evokes a difficulty: "since the position of quiescence is assured to all the articulating organs in the absence of any direction respecting them, of what use is this precept?" The reply is: *e* (as taught by rule 17, above) is to be produced with the edges of the middle of the tongue, and the *a* contained in that letter is of the same character; hence it might be inferred, from the identity of the *a*-quality, that *a* was to be so uttered in other situations, as in words like *atha* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup> et al., if the word is to be regarded here as a citation)—a misapprehension which the rule removes. To this reply the objection may be raised that our treatise acknowledges the presence of no such element as *a* in *e*, and that an *a* uttered with the middle of the tongue is a phonetic impossibility. The direction respecting the tongue may well enough be regarded as a not entirely negative one; or it may have been deemed desirable to fix so very mobile and unruly a member by a special law.

## अकारवदोष्ठी ॥ २१ ॥

21. The lips are as in the utterance of *a*.

We are directed to include in this rule, by vicinage, "in the absence of special direction." The proper position of the lips for uttering *a* was given in rule 12, above. As illustration is added, quite needlessly, the word *indrah* (*passim*); the southern manuscripts read instead *indriyāvaḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>).

20. *yatra jihvāgreṇa jihvāmādhyeṇa 'ty ādir' anādeṣas<sup>2</sup> tatra vishaye jihvā pranyastā tūshṇīmabhūtā<sup>3</sup> bhavati: prakarshēṇa nyastā pranyastā<sup>4</sup>. yathā: upa----- nanv anādeṣe sarvakaraṇānām tūshṇīmabhāvasiddheḥ kimartho 'yam ārambhah. ucyate: ekārasya jihvāmādhyāntanishpādyaṭvam<sup>5</sup> asti: tadavayavasyā<sup>6</sup> 'kārasya tathātvaṁ asti: akāratvasāmyād anyatrā<sup>7</sup> 'py athe 'ty āddu tathātvaṁ prasajyeta: tac cā 'nīṣṭam: tan mā bhād iti parihārah. 'nā<sup>8</sup> 'deṣo 'nādeṣaḥ<sup>9</sup>: tasmin: upadeṣābhāva ity arthah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ādina*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *anupadeṣaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *-ñibh-*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *āyamānatvam*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *asti 'ti*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>8</sup> W. *anvādeṣaḥ*; B. *anādeṣaḥ*.

21. *sāmniidhyād anādeṣa iti labhyate: oṣṭhāyora yatrā 'nādeṣas tatrā 'kāravaḥ akāre yathā tathā<sup>1</sup> oṣṭhāru bhavataḥ: nā 'tyupa-samhrtatarāv<sup>2</sup> ity arthah. yathā: indra<sup>3</sup> iti.*

<sup>1</sup> MSS. *tathā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-hrtāv*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *indriyāva*.

## तालौ जिह्वामध्यमिवर्णे ॥ २२ ॥

22. In the *i*-vowels, the middle of the tongue is to be approximated to the palate.

The comment supplies, without remark, the predicate "to be approximated," and gives as example *ishe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.).

## एकारे च ॥ २३ ॥

23. Also in *e*.

Here the "also" (*ca*) brings down the whole of the preceding precept, both the specification of the active organ (*karana*) and that of the passive organ or place (*sthāna*). The exposition of the meaning of the rule is very simple and easy; but the commentator does not fail to notice that its necessity is open to objection upon two grounds, and enters into its defense at considerable length. The first objection is, why make two separate rules (22 and 23) for a single direction?—that is to say, if the *i*-vowels and *e* are all produced by the approximation of the middle of the tongue to the palate, why not include them in one rule together? The answer given is that the degree of approximation is not the same in the two cases, but is less in the *e* than in the *i*-vowels. If it be asked, why is this so? the reply is made, because the *e* is mixed with *a*, and production of this *a* with the middle of the tongue is on account of its constituting a part of *e*, and not by reason of its own natural character (compare the comment to rule 20, above)—which special qualification is sufficient ground for the less degree of approximation. The second difficulty is stated thus: both place and organ of *e* have been already defined in rules 15–17, above; but here is laid down for the same letter something different: and it is not possible that both directions should be followed

22. *ivarṇe kārye jihvāmadhyam tālāv upasamhartavyam. yathā: ishe----- 'jihvāyā madhyam' jihvāmadhyam?*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om.

23. *akārah pūrvavidhim anvādiṣati: ekāre kārye 'jihvāmadhyam tālāv' upasamhartavyam<sup>2</sup>. nanu vidhau samāne prthak-sātrārambhaḥ kimarthaḥ<sup>3</sup>. ucyate: ivarṇe yathā jihvāmadhyopasamhāro na khalv evam ekāre kim tu tato<sup>4</sup> nyāna ity arthaḥ: kutaḥ: akāramiṣritatvād ekārasya: akārasya ca tadekadegatvāj jihvāmadhyāntanishpādyatvaṁ<sup>5</sup> na tu svataḥ: ata eva sopādhi-katvān nyūnatvopapattih. īśhatprakṛṣṭāv (ii.15) ity atra<sup>6</sup> sātratrāyenāi 'kārasya sthānakarane nirdiṣṭe: iha tu tato "nyat tasyāi" 'va nirdiṣyate: tad ekasminn ubhayathā kartum na śak-yate: virodhāt tasmād atra yogavibhāgaḥ kartavyaḥ<sup>7</sup>: avyā-*

in the production of one sound. To get rid of this difficulty, a division must be made; the former description must be understood as applying to *e* by itself, and the present one to *e* combined with a consonant. How is this determination made? Why, when we say in a general way "the letter *e*," it lies nearest, or is most natural, to understand that letter itself, without a consonant; hence, because of its prior suggestedness, the first definition belongs to it; and the other is left, to be applied to the same sound as combined with a consonant.

The utter artificiality of the answer to the second objection is too obvious to need pointing out; and even the first evokes more difficulties than it removes. There is no inconsistency whatever between rules 17 and 23, and we have reason to be surprised only at the repetition in the latter of what is implied already in the former. Rule 23 has the air of being an afterthought, slipped in, because of the really close relationship between *e* and *i*, with disregard of what had been taught before. The alleged difference of degree of approximation exists clearly enough, but would be very insufficiently intimated by a mere separation of one rule into two.

## श्रोत्रोपसंस्कार उवर्णे ॥ २४ ॥

24. In the *u*-vowels, there is approximation of the lips.

After his paraphrase of the rule, the commentator enters here upon an exposition, the intent of which is not altogether clear to me. "Here, he says, approximation is as formerly, and not mere drawing down together" (that is, of the same kind as was taught in rule 14, above, and not the *prakṛṣṭatā*, 'protraction,' of rule 15, which is there glossed by *saṁnikṛṣṭatā*?). "However, 'the lips drawn down together may be long'—this will be said hereafter" (by this phrase some direction given later in the treatise is

*jane tal lakṣhaṇaṁ savyañjane tv etad iti. kuto 'yaṁ niyamaḥ. ucyate: 'ekāra iti' sāmānyoktā satyām* <sup>10</sup>*prathamam avyañjana-syāi* <sup>10</sup>*'va grahaṇaṁ mukhyaṁ* <sup>11</sup>*tathā sati prathamapratiṭes* <sup>12</sup>*tasmin prathamam lakṣhaṇaṁ yujyate: savyañjane* <sup>13</sup>*pāriṣeṣhyād etad iti vijñeyam.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. G. M. -*dhyāntāu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*vyāu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*tham*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*ato*. <sup>5</sup> B. -*dhyāntābhyān nish-*; G. M. -*dhyānish-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*om*. (<sup>7</sup>) W. -*nyasyāi*; B. -*nye t-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -*om*. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. -*ekārasya*. <sup>10</sup> B. -*pratham av-*; G. M. -*maṁ vy-*. <sup>11</sup> W. -*sukaram*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. -*maṁ pra-*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. -*ins. tu*.

24. *uvarṇe kārya oṣṭhōpasamhāro bhavati: atro 'pasamhārah pūrvāvan na saṁnikṛṣṭatāmātram: kiṁ tu: saṁnikṛṣṭāv oṣṭhāu dīrghāu syātām iti vakshyate: evam oṣṭhāu tū 'pa-samhṛtatarāv (ii.14) ity atrā 'pi vijñeyam. yathā: ul----- oṣṭhāyor upasamhāra oṣṭhōpasamhārah* <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*om*.

wont to be cited; but there is no such direction as this, either in text or in commentary); "the same is to be understood in rule 14, above" (compare a similar reference to a preceding rule in the comment to ii.18). A phrase is then cited from the Sanhitā, containing *u* and *ū*, namely *utūkkhalabudhno yāpaḥ* (vii.2.1<sup>3</sup>).

## एकान्तरस्तु सर्वत्र प्रकृतात् ॥ २५ ॥

25. But, in all cases, with an interval of one from the preceding.

The commentary on this very obscure rule reads as follows:

By vicinage, "labial approximation" is here implied: everywhere, in the case of labial vowels, after the preceding labial approximation; a separate labial approximation is to be made, provided it have an interval of one: by this is understood having the quantity of a *mora* interposed: that, namely, has an interval of one whereof one *mora* is the interval or interposition. This is the distinctive condition of the separate labial approximation. The word "but" (*tu*) denies the necessity of the interval of one in a case where *o* [W. says, where *āu* or *v*] follows. Examples are: *utpūtaçushmam* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>); *sūnnīyam iti su-unnīyam* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>); *atho oshadhīshu* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>); *bāhuvoḥ bālam* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>); *tanuvāu ghorā 'nyā* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); *caturhotā* (not found in the Sanhitā: occurs Tāitt. Brāh. ii.2.3<sup>2</sup>).

Objection: in *yo 'ñgum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>), the *anusvāra* has a *mora* [by i.34] and the *ç* a half-*mora* [by i.37]; since, then, the quantity being a *mora* and a half, there is not an interval of one, how is the separate labial approximation assured?

Answer: it is assured by the principle "a hundred includes fifty." Where there is a *mora* and a half, there is *à fortiori* a *mora*; in virtue of this the prescribed effect is produced, but its excess does not vitiate the rule, because the word "one" excludes what does not belong to itself (?) For the same reason, the occurrence

25. *sānnidhīd oshthopasaṁhāra iti labhyate: sarvatr' oshthya-svareṣhu prakṛtād oshthopasaṁhārāt prthagoshthopasaṁhārah 'kartavyaḥ: sa ced ekāntaraḥ': ekāntara iti mātṛākālavyavāya' iti labhyate': ekamātṛā 'ntaram vyavadhānam yasyā 'sāv ekāntaraḥ: iti prthagoshthopasaṁhārasya viçeṣaṇam. tuçabda okāraparava' ekāntaratvaniyamam' nīvaratayati. uddharaṇāni: ut-<sup>6</sup> sūn-: atho-: bāh-: tan-: cat-: nanu yo- ity atrā 'nusvārasya mātṛākālāḥ 'çakārasya 'rdhamātṛākālāḥ: evam adhyardhamātrātrve saty ekāntaratvābhāvāt' ka-tham prthagoshthopasaṁhārasiddhiḥ. ucyate: gatepañcāçannīdyena sidhyati: adhyardhamātrātrve 'py' ekamātrātrvaṁ sūtaram'<sup>10</sup> asti; tena kāryam bhavaty adhiḥkāṁ tu na nishidhyate: svādyogavyavachhedakatvād ekaçabdasya: ata eva bāh- ity āder<sup>11</sup> na*



of the double labial in such passages as *bāhuvor balam ūruvor ojah* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word) is not primary (or original), but its quality as *sphurita*, 'quavered,' is shown by the likeness of the example (?).

Second objection: then why is there not a separate labial approximation in the two *u*'s following the *k* and *r* of *kusurubindah* (vii. 2.2<sup>1</sup>), since there occurs more than a *mora* and a half of interval between them?

Answer: not so; here there is denial of separate labiality only for the two *u*'s that follow *k* and *s*, because of the absence of its necessary condition; but to that following the *r* this rule does not apply, because it is not a case of separateness from the preceding, but of separateness from the *u* that follows the intermediate *s*; this being so, there is no occurrence of the interval of one for a letter in this situation: thus there is no offense against the rule.

So far the comment; but either I have failed to apprehend its true meaning, or it has given a false interpretation to the rule, or the rule itself is destitute of intelligible significance. I must confess myself unable to see what peculiarity there should be in the utterance of two labial vowels following one another in two successive syllables with not less than a *mora*'s interval between them. No precept, so far as I know, in any of the other Prātiśākhya, is analogous with this, or casts light upon it.

It appears to be intimated, in the course of the answer to the first objection, that the peculiar utterance of the *u* in such words as *bāhuvoh* for the usual *bāhvoh* and *ūruvoh* for *ūrvoh* is denominated *sphurita*. The term does not occur elsewhere; nor is any notice taken of the phenomenon, if not here. It is a well-known characteristic of Tāittiriya texts, but is found in fewer words than one would be apt to imagine. Besides the two just given, I have noted in the Sanhitā only the cases of *tanā* (*tanuvam*, e.g. i.1.8; *tanuvā*, e.g. i.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and the word *suvar*, which are often met with. Of similar resolutions of an *i*-vowel into *iy*, the cases are more nu-

*dviroshthya*<sup>12</sup> mukhyam: kin tu sphuritativam<sup>13</sup> udāharanatvā bhdasatayā<sup>14</sup> darṣitam. tarhi kus- ity atra kakārarephābhyām uttarayor ukṛayoh katham prthagoshthopasamhāro na bhavati: adhyardhamātravayavāyasambhavāt<sup>15</sup>. māi 'vam: atra<sup>16</sup> kakārasakārottarayor<sup>17</sup> ukṛayos tāvad<sup>18</sup> aprthagoshthātā<sup>19</sup>: etallakṣhaṇāsambhavāt: rephād uttarasya tu<sup>20</sup> prakṛtāt prthaktvābhāvanā 'yam vidhiḥ: <sup>21</sup>kin tu<sup>21</sup> madhyasthasakārottaraḍ ukṛāt prthaktvam: tathā saty ekāntarābhāvaḥ<sup>22</sup>: tadavustha<sup>23</sup> eve 'ti lakṣaṇam idam avyabhicaritam<sup>24</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -labhedavy-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. arthah. <sup>4</sup> W. dukṛavakārap-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ekamātrānantaratvā-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. (<sup>7</sup>) B. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ekāratv-. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. muttarām. <sup>11</sup> G. M. dādu. <sup>12</sup> G. M. -thyatvam. <sup>13</sup> G. M. svar-. <sup>14</sup> W. -haratvā; B. -tvabh-; G. M. -nan tu ābh-. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -vyavadhānas-. <sup>16</sup> G. M. om. <sup>17</sup> G. M. -rābhyām utt-. <sup>18</sup> G. M. -van. <sup>19</sup> G. M. na prthagoshthāsamhāratā. <sup>20</sup> W. u; B. om. (<sup>21</sup>) W. B. om. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -vāt. <sup>23</sup> W. -stha; B. -sthā. <sup>24</sup> G. M. vyabh-.

merous, but less frequent. I have collected the following (without exhausting the *Sanhitā*, especially of themes in *īya*): *āgrīya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *aghniya* (i.1.1), *āgviya* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>), *asmadrīyañc* (i.4.21), *idhrīya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *dhīshniya* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *pātrīya* (iii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *budhniya* (i.3.3), *rēshniya* (iv.5.7<sup>2</sup>), *viśvāpsniyā* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup>), *viśvadrīyañc* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>), *vr̥shniya* (iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>), *ś'ghriya* (iv.5.5<sup>2</sup>), *sadhriyañc* (i.2.14<sup>5</sup>); and, of oblique cases from themes in *i* or *ī*, *indrāgniyoḥ* (i.3.12), *gāya-triyā'* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>), *pārshniyā* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>), *pr̥cniyāi* (ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>), *rātriyai* (iv.4.1<sup>1</sup>), *lakshmiyā* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), *viśpātniyāi* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *svādhiyam* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>). None of the consonantal combinations which are thus avoided by the resolution of the *u* are such as the euphony of the *Tāittirīyakas* does not tolerate: but of those which are avoided by the resolution of the *i*, only three are met with in the text—namely, *try* (e.g. i.8.22<sup>1</sup>: ii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), *tny* (iv.4.2<sup>2</sup>), and *cny* (v.5.6<sup>3</sup>). I have not entered deeply enough into the investigation to deduce the law, if law there be, by which the resolution is made.

अकारार्धमैकारौकारयोरादिः ॥ २६ ॥

26. The beginning of *āi* and *āu* is half an *a*.

Rules 28 and 29, below, tell of what constitutes the remainder of these diphthongs.

संवृतकण्ठातरमेकेषाम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. Which, in the opinion of some, is uttered with the organs more closed.

We have here another indication that, as intimated above (under ii.12), our *Prātiṣākhya* does not recognize the close or neutral pronunciation of the short *a*; for, if it did so, there would obviously be no reason for referring to the opinion held by certain authorities respecting its assumption of that utterance in diphthongal combination. Some phonetists (without sufficient reason, as it appears to me) have in like manner defined the first element in our English diphthongs ("long *i*" in *aisle*, *isle*, and *ou* or *ow* in *house*, *down*) to be the neutral vowel (*u* in *but*), rather than the open *a* (of *far*). But, whatever may have been the case with the Sanskrit diphthongs, our own cannot be truly described as composed of two elements each: they are slides; and to allow the organs to remain in

26. *āikārasyaū "kārasya cā "dir akārārdham bhavati. akārasyā 'rdham akārārdham.*

27. *sāmnidhyād akārārdham iti labhyate: ekeshām mate tad akārārdham saṁvṛtakaraṇātaram bhavati. saṁvṛtāni sāmnikṛshṭāni karaṇāni yasya tat saṁvṛtakaraṇam: atīcayena saṁvṛtakaraṇam saṁvṛtakaraṇātaram.*

B. reads *saṁvṛta* throughout.

either their first or last position long enough to make the initial or final element distinctly audible, would be an error of pronunciation.

The commentator glosses *sumvṛta*, 'enveloped, shut up, closed,' with *samnikṛṣṭa*, 'drawn down together, approximated.'

इकारोऽध्यर्धः पूर्वस्य शेषः ॥ २८ ॥

28. Of the former, the rest is one and a half times *i*.

Of the former—that is, of *āi*; *āi* and *āu* having been mentioned together in a preceding rule (ii.26), says the commentator.

उकारस्तूत्रस्य ॥ २९ ॥

29. But, of the latter, *u*.

That is to say, the remainder of *āu* is one and a half times *u*. To account for the word "but" (*tu*) in the rule, the commentator notes that, as the beginning of both diphthongs is the same sound, *a*, it might seem to follow that their end would be the same sound, *i*: this the "but" denies. This explanation merely intensifies and makes too precise the actual meaning of the word.

For the teachings of the other Prāticākhya's as to the pronunciation of *āi* and *āu*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.40. As there remarked, the euphonic treatment which they receive proves their first element to have had originally more than a half-mora of quantity. If they must be limited to two moras, a better description of them would have been  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}i$ , and  $1\frac{1}{2}a + \frac{1}{2}u$ . If, as we may presume to be the case, the authors of these treatises defined their own pronunciation pretty accurately, then the *āi* and *āu*, not less than the *e* and *o*, had by their time taken on a value notably different from that which belonged to them when the euphonic rules of the language were the faithful representation of living processes.

अनुस्वारोत्तमा अनुनासिकाः ॥ ३० ॥

30. *Anusvāra* and the last mutes are nasal.

As example of *anusvāra*, the comment cites *yo 'ñṣum* (iii.3.4<sup>3</sup>);

28. *pūrvasyāi* "kārasye 'ty arthaḥ: *adhastād* 'āikārdūkārayoḥ saḥocaritatvāt<sup>2</sup>: *adhyardha ikāra āikārasya śesho bhavati. adhikam ardham yasyā* 'sāv *adhyardhaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *adhyardhas tāvad*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *uccar-*.

29. *uttarasyaū* "kārasye 'ty arthaḥ: *adhyardha ukāra āukāraśesho* 'bhavati: *yathā* 'nayoṛ ubhayor apy ādir akāra eva *tadvad ikāra eva śeṣaḥ*<sup>3</sup> *prasaktaḥ: tan*<sup>3</sup> *nishedhati tuṣabdaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-rasya śe-*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *om*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *tan*.

of the "last" or nasal mutes, *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>)—to which G. M. add *prāñcam upa* (v.2.7<sup>3</sup>), and *manind* (vii.3.14).

The term *anunāsika* is interpreted by the commentator as signifying *nāsikām anuvartate*, 'it goes after the nostril'—that is to say, doubtless, 'it finds exit by the nasal passages:' an accurate definition of this class of sounds. As employed in this Prāṭiśākhya, *anunāsika* means simply, as adjective, 'nasal,' and its derivative noun, *anunāsikya*, signifies 'nasality, nasal utterance.' Rule 52, below, describes how such mode of utterance is produced, and in chapter xvii. (rules 1-4) is made an attempt to define the degree of nasality in the various sounds of the class. "Nasal," or *anunāsika*, by the present rule, are the *anusvāra* and the five nasal mutes, *ñ, ñ, ṇ, ṇ, m*; the same term is applied later to the nasal semivowels into which *ṇ* and *m* (v.26-28) are under certain circumstances convertible; and at v.31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxii.14, we also hear of nasal (*anunāsika*) vowels. The other nose-sounds, the *yamas* and *nāsikya* (ii.49,50, xxi.8,12-14), do not anywhere receive this title.

It is desirable to put together somewhere a comprehensive statement of the doctrines held by the Tāittirīya-Prāṭiśākhya respecting the nasal constituents of the alphabet it recognizes, and no more suitable place is likely to present itself than is offered here.

All nasal (*anunāsika*) sounds are uttered (ii.52) by the mouth and nose together. An *uttama*, a "last" or nasal mute, is a sound in the production of which the intonated breath escapes through the nose, while the organs of the mouth form one of those same contacts which give rise to the corresponding non-nasal mutes of the series. In *anusvāra*, on the other hand (including under that designation the nasal semivowels, of which more further on), the mouth-organs are not wholly closed, but the intonated breath finds exit through them at the same time that it passes through the nasal cavities. In all cases, then, in which the character of the nasal of a syllable is determined by that of the following consonant, the nasal will be a mute if the latter is a mute, but an *anusvāra* if succeeded by a letter not forming a contact—by a semivowel or a spirant. Respecting the phonetic character and occurrence of the nasal mutes, there has been no difference of opinion, so far as we have any information, among the Hindu phonetists of the period represented by the Prāṭiśākhyas; none of them has allowed a final *anusvāra* before a pause, or an *anusvāra* before a mute, either in the same or a following word. As to the phonetic value, however, of the real *anusvāra*, the nasal uttered with open mouth-organs, there was by no means the same accordance among those ancient grammarians. Some held it to be a pervading nasalisation of the preceding vowel; others, a nasal addition to

---

30. *anusvāraḥ co 'ttamaḥ cā 'nunāsikā bhavanti: nāsikām anuvartanta ity anunāsikāḥ. yathā: anusvāraḥ: yo----- uttamā ca* <sup>1</sup>: *pra-----* <sup>2</sup>: *prā-----* <sup>3</sup>: *man-*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. om.

that vowel. The former view is adopted and consistently maintained by the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā, which acknowledges nasal consonants and nasalized vowels, but no *tertium quid*. The Prātiçākhyās of the Rik and White Yajus are equally consistent in their recognition of an *anusvāra* as nasal appendage to the vowel, and the latter of them gives (Vāj. Pr. iv.147-8) detailed directions as to the quantity belonging to each element. The Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhyā adopts prevailing the same view, but lets the other appear distinctly in some of its rules. Thus, at v.31, it is stated to be Âtreya's opinion that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the preceding vowel is nasalized; and, in conformity with this, xv.1 directly teaches that, after the various conversion of *m* and *n*, the vowel before them becomes nasal, the following rules adding (xv.2,3) that some authorities deny this, and direct *anusvāra* to be inserted instead: here the commentary has to reverse the obvious intent of the text, and declare the latter rules approved, and the first disapproved. Further, x.11 directs that when a vowel is combined with a nasalized vowel the result is nasal (the commentary, however, gives a different interpretation: see the rule). Once more, in xxii.14, among "heavy" syllables is reckoned one that is *anundāsika*, 'nasal.'

I very much doubt whether this difference of views is founded upon an actual difference of pronunciation; it is probably due rather to a discordant apprehension and analysis of a single mode of utterance. The same point might divide into two parties our phonetists at the present day—just as they have long been divided upon the question whether a *b* differs from a *p* in being sonant, or in being soft, or weak, or of inferior aspiration, or something of that kind. Without entering into any detailed discussion of the subject, I will simply say that I incline to side with the Atharvan school, and to believe in nasal vowels rather than in *anusvāra*. No one of the Prātiçākhyās gives an intelligible definition of the phonetic character of *anusvāra*, considered as an independent alphabetic element; if it is to be so considered, we shall hardly be able to make of it anything but a bit of the neutral vowel (*u* of *but*) nasalized, or the sound of the French *un*, and shall have to regard it as attached to the vowel much in the same way as, by us who speak English, the same sound not nasalized is attached to most of our long vowels before an *r*—for example, in *there*, *here*, *oar*, *cure*, *fire*, *sour* (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.353).

Which of the two views is originally favored by the Devanāgarī alphabet does not admit of much question; the writing of *aṁṣa*, for example,\* with a nasal sign over the vowel of the first syllable, is an unequivocal recognition of the quality as something affecting the vowel itself. If it had seemed to the framers of this alphabet to be a something interposed between the vowel and the following consonant, they would doubtless have

---

\* Namely, अंश, or अँश

found for it a sign to stand between those of the other elements. This has actually been done, out of a true regard for consistency, by the writers of the Vājasaneyi and Tāittirīya texts: for lack of a better device, they have brought down one of the usual signs of nasality from above the syllable to a position between the syllables, giving it an addition which enables it to maintain its place there \*—in the Tāittirīya texts, we have the dotted crescent, with the *virāma*, the usual mark for a consonant not graphically combined with a following consonant, beneath it. The scribes of the Rig-Veda seem to have been less solicitous to make their practice square with their theory. It may well be made a question, however, whether the habit, now so common, of writing *amka*, *amta*, *ambā*, for *aika*, *anta*, *ambā*, etc.,† could have grown up until the opinion had become prevalent that the nasal sign in *amca* also represented a nasal sound which followed the vowel, and was accommodated in its special mode of utterance to its successor.‡

One more point in the theory of the nasal sounds calls for notice. The assimilation of *n* to a following *l*, and of *m* to a following *l*, *y*, or *v* (v. 26-8), is treated by the Tāittirīya, the Vājasaneyi, and the Rik Prātiçākhyas as resulting in the production, not of *anusvāra*, but of a nasal counterpart to the semivowel—that is, the case is made analogous with that of a nasal before a mute, instead of before a spirant. Here, also, the Atharva-Prātiçākhyā pursues an independent course, and accepts no nasal *y* or *v*, but only a nasal *l*, as product of both *m* and *n* (see Ath. Pr. ii.35). In this case, as well as in the other, we have to assume merely a difference in the theoretical explanation of an identical mode of pronunciation; and I should not only favor the Atharvan view, but should be willing to give up the nasal *l* itself, as not worth distinguishing from an ordinary case of *anusvāra*—or of nasalized vowel, if we accept this understanding of the matter. Thus much, indeed, may be allowed—that, while the absence of sonant utterance in the spirants cuts them off from sharing in a nasal quality, it might be difficult to prevent the nasality of the preceding vowel from infecting at least

\* Thus, for अंश or अँश, the Vāj. S. writes अ॒ंश, the Tāitt. S. अं॒श.

† That is, अंक, अंत, अंबा, for अङ्क, अन्त, अम्बा.

‡ No valid objection can be raised against the, practically so convenient, imitation of this habit on the part of modern European scholars, so far as concerns the representation of an original *m* assimilated to a following consonant. To go farther than this, however, and write the *anusvāra* sign in the interior of a word for a nasal mute which is equally radical or thematic with the succeeding non nasal, and, yet more, to write it for a final *m*, which no Prātiçākhyā allows to be pronounced otherwise than *m*, seems an indefensible practice, and one wholly to be disapproved and rejected. Of Müller's seemingly elaborate defense of his adherence to it, given in the Preface to his *Hitopadeça*, absolutely the whole point lies in the phrases (p. xi.): "it is easier to write *ahkita* than *ahkita*. What applies to writing applies with still greater force to printing"—which latter consideration must be pronounced destitute of weight; since, on the contrary, we do expect our printing to be superior in accuracy to ordinary writing.

the beginning of the sonant semivowels. For the exclusion of *r* from the same treatment with the other semivowels I can discover no good reason.

The usage of the manuscripts is pretty nearly in accordance with the theories of the *Prâtīcākhya*. For an assimilated *m*, the distinctive *anusvāra* sign is always written before *r*, as before the spirants; but before *l*, *y*, and *v* is written the sign of nasality above the preceding syllable, as before a mute. But as regards *n* before *l*, my manuscript varies with complete irregularity between treating it like *m*, as required by the *Prâtīcākhya*, and writing the *n* unchanged, either with *virāma* or conjoined with the *l* (instances of the latter mode of treatment are about twice as frequent as of the former). The edited text more usually follows a third method, supported neither by my manuscript nor by the *Prâtīcākhya*: it writes the *l* double, and puts a sign of nasality over the preceding syllable. This is nonsense: if two *l*'s are written, the first should be separated from the other, and should have the sign of nasality written above it. But there is no reason why this should be done in the case of a combination of *l* with *n* any more than with *m*, or than in the combination of *m* with *y* and *v*.

It only remains to add that, in my manuscripts (T. and W.) and those at Berlin and Oxford (B. and O.), the text of the *Prâtīcākhya* follows, in regard to the treatment of the nasals as to other points of euphony, the usages of the *Tāttirīya* text, and that the citations from the latter in the commentary are also written accordingly; while the body of the commentary itself follows the methods of ordinary Sanskrit texts. In this edition, therefore, their example is followed as closely as possible: the proper *anusvāra* being represented by *ñ*, and the *m*-assimilated to a mute or semivowel, by *m̐*. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. and M.) do not distinguish these two from one another.

## स्वराणां यत्रोपसङ्गस्तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३१ ॥

31. In the case of the vowels, that is their place of production, to which approximation is made.

The term *upasaṁhāra*, 'approximation,' is glossed by *upaśleṣa-viśeṣaḥ*, 'a sort of embrace'—unless, indeed, we are to read, with G. and M., *saṁśleṣaviśeṣaḥ*, 'disunion of embrace,' i. e., 'embrace which does not come to actual contact.'

The terms *sthāna*, 'place,' and *karana*, 'organ,' denote, as in the other *Prâtīcākhyas* (see note to Ath. Pr. i.18), the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth whose concurrence gives birth to a sound.

---

31. *svarāṇāṁ tat sthānam bhavati yatro 'pasamhāraḥ syāt: upasamhāro nāmo 'paśleṣaviśeṣaḥ*².

¹ B. om. ² W. 'paśleṣ-; G. M. *saṁśleṣaviśeṣaḥ*.

## यडुपसंस्करति तत्करणम् ॥ ३२ ॥

32. That is producing organ, which makes the approximation.

Here, "in the case of the vowels" is declared to be implied from the preceding rule; *upasaṁharati*, 'approaches,' is explained by *prāpayati*, 'attains;' and, as example of a *kāraṇa*, or producing organ, reference is made to the "tip of the tongue," spoken of in rule 18 of this chapter.

## अन्येषां तु यत्र स्पर्शनिं तत्स्थानम् ॥ ३३ ॥

33. But in the case of the other letters, that is place of production, where contact is made.

By this expression, the commentator says, simple embrace or union is predicated of the consonants, while above a sort of embrace (or disunion of embrace) was predicated of the vowels. The difference, he adds, between approximation and contact will be inferred by any knowing person from the force of the terms themselves. The word "but" (*tu*) is meant to exclude the vowels; or, as Māhisheya explains it, annuls for *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti* the quality of being produced by contact merely, like the other consonants. This last is a precious bit of pregnant construction; and the whole comment is more obscure than the rule itself, whose meaning and implication are sufficiently obvious.

## येन स्पर्शयति तत्करणम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. That is producing organ, whereby one makes the contact.

The commentator supplies, as subject of the verb, the noun *adhyetā*, 'reader'—or, rather, 'repeater.'

32. *svaṛāṇāṁ iti sāmīdhyādī labhyate: svaṛāṇāṁ tat karanam bhavati: yat svaṛāṇ upasaṁharati prāpayati: 'tat karanam'. yathā: jīhvāgram ṛkāra (ii.18) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> B. *tat sthānam*; G. M. om.

33. *svarebhyo 'nyeshāṁ varṇāṇāṁ tat sthānaṁ yatra sparṇanam bhavet: atra vyañjanāṇāṁ saṁśleshamātrāṇāṁ kathiyate: svaṛāṇāṁ tu<sup>2</sup> purastāt saṁśleshah<sup>3</sup> kathitah: upasaṁhārasparṇanuyoh<sup>4</sup> gāḍagaktyā viśesho<sup>5</sup> viduṣhā vijñeyah<sup>6</sup>: tuṣabdah<sup>7</sup> svaṇ-nivṛttiyarthah: athavā<sup>8</sup>: anusvārasvarabhaktyor vyañjanavat<sup>9</sup> sparṇanamātrakatvanivartaka<sup>10</sup> iti māhisheyaabhāṣhitam*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*glosh*; G. M. -*mātratvam*. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> G. -*shaviśeshah*; M. -*shaviśeshah*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*hāra* *iti sparṇana*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *jñātavyah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *gāḍa*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. -*navē*; B. -*na*. <sup>10</sup> B. *sparṇakāṇamāḍa*; G. M. *sparṇamātrakāṇam*; M. -*vartata*.



In these four rules is implied that distinction of opener and closer position between vowel and consonant which constitutes their essential difference (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.367 seq.), and which the Ath. Pr. states more fully (i.29-35:—where, in rule 33, we should read *eke* 'sprsh̥tam), with specifications of degree of openness and closure which are here omitted (save so far as represented by rule 45, below).

कनूमूले जिह्वामूलेन कवर्गे स्पर्शयति ॥ ३५ ॥

35. In the *k*-series, one makes contact with the root of the tongue at the root of the jaws.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.20, and the references to the other Prâtigāhyas there given.

The locative and instrumental cases, in this and the following rules, correspond with the *yatra*, 'where,' and *yena*, 'whereby,' of rules 33 and 34, above, and point out respectively the place and organ of production of the different classes of sounds.

The singular number of *hanūmāla*, 'root of the jaws,' the commentator accounts for as used generically (*jātyapekshāyām*, 'with reference to the whole kind or class').

तालौ जिह्वामध्येन चवर्गे ॥ ३६ ॥

36. In the *c*-series, with the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.21, and the note upon it. The sonant aspirate of this series, *jh*, is not met with in the text.

जिह्वेण प्रतिवेद्य मूर्धनि टवर्गे ॥ ३७ ॥

37. In the *ṭ*-series, with the tip of the tongue, rolled back, in the head.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.22, and the note upon it. Our commentary says, "by the word 'head' (*mūrdhan*) is intended the upper part

34. *sāmniḍhyād anyeshām iti labhyate: svarebhyo 'nyeshānī varṇānām tat karanam bhavati: adhyetā yena ryañjanānī sparśayati prāpayati tat karanam.*

35. *kavarga uccāryamāne jīhvāmūleṇa<sup>1</sup> hanūmūle sparśayati prāpayet ity arthaḥ. hanvor mūlām hanūmūlam<sup>2</sup>: tasmīn<sup>3</sup>:<sup>4</sup> jātyapekshāyām<sup>5</sup> ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇām*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *mūlām iti*. <sup>5</sup> W. *-kshām*.

36. *ṣavarge kārye<sup>1</sup> jīhvāmadhyena varṇān<sup>2</sup> tālāu spr̥ṣet<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *tālāu* here. <sup>2</sup> M. *-nām*. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥ṣayet*; G. M. *sparśayet*.

of the mouth-cavity." Perhaps we shall best remove the difficulties attaching to the use of the word "head" in describing this class of sounds, by assuming that the name *mārdhanya*, 'capital,' had become firmly established in use as designating them, at an earlier period of phonetic science in India, when their mode of production was less accurately understood and defined; and was therefore retained by the later grammarians, who gave to it a new definition. For, that *mārdhan* should have been taken directly and without ceremony to signify the 'dome of the palate' does not appear to me possible. As in the notes to the Atharva-Prāṭicākhya, I shall take the liberty of speaking of the *t*-sounds as "lingual"—a term, on the whole, as unobjectionable and as commonly accepted as any other.

The commentator glosses the word *pratIVEShtya*, 'having rolled it back,' by "having doné what? having rolled back (G. M. add in explanation *āveshtya*, 'having rolled up') the tip of the tongue, on account of its suitableness" (i. e. of the adaptedness of this position to produce the contact aimed at).

जिह्वेण तवर्गे दन्तमूलेषु ॥ ३८ ॥

38. In the *t*-series, with the tip of the tongue, at the roots of the teeth.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.24, and the note upon it.

ओष्ठाभ्यां पवर्गे ॥ ३९ ॥

39. In the *p*-series, with the two lips.

The commentator explains that here the upper lip is the place of production, as the various places of production mentioned have been the upper organ; and that the under lip is the organ of production.

Compare Ath. Pr. i.25, and the note upon it.

37. *ṭavarge kārye jihvāgreṇa* <sup>1</sup> *mārdhni* <sup>2</sup> *varṇam spr̥ṣet* <sup>3</sup>: *kiṁ kṛtvā*: *yogyatvā* <sup>4</sup> *jihvāgram pratIVEShtya* <sup>5</sup>: *mārdhaṣabdena vak-travivaroparibhāgo vivakshyate* <sup>6</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put *varṇam* here. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *mārdhani*. <sup>3</sup> B. *spr̥ṣayet*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*tvā*; B. -*tvā* *taj*; G. -*tvān*; M. -*tvāyogyatvān*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*shtyāveshtya*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*kshita*.

38. *ṭavarge kārye jihvāgreṇa varṇam dantamūleṣu spar̥ṣayet* <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *spr̥ṣet*.

39. *pavarge kārya oṣṭhābhyām anyonyam spar̥ṣayet*: *atro* <sup>1</sup> *ttaroṣṭha sthānam uttaratvasāmyād* <sup>2</sup> *eshām sthānānām*: *adharoṣṭhaḥ karāṇam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *tatro*. <sup>2</sup> B. -*rātvāt sāmānyād*; G. M. *oṣṭhatva*.

## तालौ जिह्वामध्यान्ताभ्यां यकारे ॥ ४० ॥

40. In *y*, with the two edges of the middle of the tongue, upon the palate.

The Tâttiriya-Prâṭiçākhyā stands alone in omitting to rank the semi-vowels along with the mutes, as palatal, etc., and in describing their formation throughout by special rule. Respecting *y*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

The description of the mode of production of *y*, here given, is quite accurate and sufficiently distinctive. The "edges" are mentioned, as being the parts which form contact with the palate, the central part remaining open, as taught for *i* in rule 22, above.

## रेफे जिह्वाग्रमध्येन प्रत्यग्दन्तमूलेभ्यः ॥ ४१ ॥

41. In *r*, with the middle of the tip of the tongue, back of the roots of the teeth.

*Pratyak* is explained by the phrase, "in the interior upper portion"—that is, 'within and above'—the equivalence of *pratyagātman* and *antarātmān*, 'inner soul,' being pleaded as justification.

The somewhat discordant teachings of the Prâṭiçākhyas with reference to this sound are detailed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.28. The most note-worthy circumstance in their common treatment of the letter is that they so ignore its special relationship with the lingual mutes, and in part with the *r*-vowels: although in this treatise the definition of the latter (ii.18) is, essentially, nearly accordant with that here given for the semi-vowel. *R* could not possibly have the value which belongs to it in the Sanskrit euphonic system, if it were not a lingual semi-vowel, like the English *r*, uttered with the tip of the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate.

## दन्तमूलेषु च लकारे ॥ ४२ ॥

42. Also in *l*, at the roots of the teeth.

According to the commentator, the "and" (*ca*) of this rule brings down by implication from the preceding both *jihvāgramādhyā*, 'middle of the tongue-tip,' and *pratyak*, 'back from.' It

40. *yakāre kārye jīhvāmādhyāntābhyān tālāu sparṣayet. jīhvāyā madhyam: tasyā 'ntāu: tābhyān jīhvāmādhyāntābhyām'.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

41. *rephē kārye jīhvāgramādhyena dantamūlebhyaḥ pratyak sparṣayet: pratyag ity 'ābhyantara uparibhāga ity arthaḥ: 'yaḥ pratyagātme 'ty' antarātmā pratiyate.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ntaropari*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *yathā pratyagātmani*.

appears obvious, however, if only from the locative case of *dantamūleshu*, that the latter item is not intended, and that we are to regard the roots of the teeth themselves (more properly, the gums close upon them) as the *sthāna*, or 'place of production,' of *l*. This, indeed, is nearly enough intimated by the final paraphrase of the comment. The really distinctive characteristic of the *l*, that it forms a contact in front, but allows the breath to escape at the sides of the tongue, is here by no means clearly brought out: rather, we are left to infer that it and the *r* are produced in the same manner, only the *r* a little further back. No one of the other treatises gives a better description (see note to Ath. Pr. i.24, where I have given the Tāittirīya definition more credit than really belongs to it).

### श्रीष्ठान्ताभ्यां दन्तैर्वकारे ॥४३॥

43. In *v*, with the edges of the lips, along with the teeth.

This rule cannot be commended for distinctness. The commentator gives it not a little of additional precision, by his paraphrase "with the two edges of the lower lip, along with the points of the upper teeth." But how comes the lower lip to have two edges? He adds, that the teeth are the place, and the lips the organ, of production. But then why does not the rule read *danteshu*, instead of the instrumental *dantāiḥ*? It gives us two instrumentals, as if teeth and lips were joint organs, and neither of them any more "place" than the other. The lower lip, being the more passive organ, should be the "place" on which the teeth, as "organ," make their contact; but from taking this view the treatise and its comment appear to be hindered by the analogy of the other *sthāna*'s, which have uniformly been the upper of the two parts concerned in the contact. To make a good definition, the rule should read *adharoshthānte* for *oshthāntābhyām*.

Of the other treatises (as pointed out in the note to Ath. Pr. i.25), the Vāj. Pr. gives the *v* a description corresponding with this, and showing the letter to have had the precise phonetic value of our English *v*. This, of course, should not in the least stand in the way of our fully recognizing the fact that its original sound was that of our *w*. The *w* is a semi-vowel, standing in the same relation to *u* as *y* to *i*; but to call *v* a semi-vowel is a sim-

42. *cakāro 'jihvāgramadhyapratyaktvam anvādicati: lakāre kārye jihvāgramadhyena<sup>2</sup>. dantamūleshu pratyak sparçayet<sup>3</sup>: ayam arthaḥ: lakārasya 'dantamūlapratyāsannam pratyaganta-rapratleçasthānam<sup>4</sup> iti vijñeyam<sup>5</sup>.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *jihvāmadhyam pratyaktvam* cā "karshati. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-hvāmādh-*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. put after *vijñeyam*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *-sannapradeça sthānam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *jñeyam*.

43. *vakāre kārye 'dharoshthāntābhyām uttaradantāgrāḥ saha sparçayet. dantāir iti sthānanirdeçāḥ: oshthāntābhyām iti karananirdeçāḥ.*

ple abuse of terms. We might nearly as well call our *j* a semi-vowel, because it is written with an originally vocalic sign, and represents in the majority of cases a sound which the Romans pronounced as *y*.

## स्पर्शस्थानेषूष्माणानुपूर्व्येण ॥ ४४ ॥

44. The spirants, in their order, are produced in the places of the mutes.

By rule i.9, there are six spirants, and as there are but five "places" of mutes, these belong to the first five spirants, as is signified by the expression "in their order:" *h*, therefore, is omitted, and its rules will be given hereafter (rules 46, 47). To this effect the commentator, who also allots the spirants to their respective mute-classes, and cites from the *Sanhitâ* an example for each: namely, for *jihvāmālīya*, uttered in the place of a *k*-mute, *yaḥ kāmāyeta* (ii.3.2<sup>4</sup> et al.: I follow the example of all the MSS., and do not attempt to distinguish the guttural and labial spirants from *visarjanīya* by different signs); for *ç*, in the place of a *c*-mute, *madhuç ca mādhaṇṇaç ca* (i.4.14, or iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words of the citation, and W. reads *manyuç ca*, which is found at iv.7.2<sup>1</sup>); for *sh*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *ashtābhyah svāhā* (vii.2.15); for *s*, in the place of a *t*-mute, *stanā uparavāḥ* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>); and for *upadhmanīya*, in the place of a *p*-mute, *yaḥ pāpmanā* (ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>).

To make this rule a definition of the mode of utterance of the spirants, the one next following is to be applied to modify it. Unfortunately, both together are insufficient to give us any clear idea of the two problematical sounds, *jihvāmālīya* and *upadhmanīya*; and there is room for us to suspect them of being, like the long *l*-vowel, an artificial fabrication of the Hindu grammarians. As for the *s*, there is no question as to its value. Nor ought there to be respecting that of the *sh*, which both the explanations of the phonetists and the phenomena of Sanskrit euphony show to have been that particular sibilant (more nearly resembling our *sh* than *s*, but sufficiently distinct from either) which is uttered with the tongue reverted into the dome of the palate. It passes my comprehension how European grammarians should continue to identify

44. *ūshmāṇa ānupūrvyēṇa yathākramēṇa sparśasthāneshū 'ccāranīyā bhavanti. yathā: jīhvāmālīyāḥ kavargasthāne: yaḥ k-: çakāraç cavargasthāne<sup>1</sup>: madhuç<sup>2</sup> ----: śhakāraśh tavargasthāne: asht- ----: sakāras tavargasthāne: stanā ----: upadhmanīyāḥ pavargasthāne: yaḥ p-: ity ānupūrvyēṇa<sup>3</sup>: ānupūrvyān<sup>4</sup> nīyamāt pañcasū 'śhmaśū 'kteshu hākāro vīṣiṣṭāḥ<sup>5</sup>: tasya vidhim upariśṭād āśashte.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *cavargyas*;- B. *cakāras*-. <sup>2</sup> W. *manyuç*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-vyā vijñeyāḥ*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-vyā*. <sup>5</sup> B. *-çeshah*; G. M. *vasiṣṭhah*.

it with our *śh*; and, yet more, how that absurd distinction of the lingual and palatal sibilants (of which, so far as I know, Wilson was the originator) which defines the former as the same with our *śh* in *shun*, and the latter with our *ss* in *session*, can still be repeated in the latest Sanskrit grammars. Absurd I call it, because there is really no difference at all between the pronunciation of *śh* in *shun* and *ss* in *session*. If our *śh* be found in the Sanskrit alphabet, it is the palatal sibilant *ç*, not the lingual, *śh*. The question of the value of *ç* is connected with and depends upon that of the palatal series of mutes; and upon this I have nothing more to say than I said in the note to Ath. Pr. i.21.

करणमध्यं तु विवृतम् ॥ ४५ ॥

45. But the middle of the producing organ is unclosed.

The "but" (*tu*) of this rule, we are told, is intended to annul (so far) the similarity of organ of the spirants with the mutes. This prescription of an unclosure of the middle of the organ is a rather artificial device for saving the credit of the general prescription of actual contact in all the consonants. It is nearly equivalent with the rules of the Ath. Pr. (i.30,31) upon the same subject.

कण्ठस्थानौ हकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ ४६ ॥

46. The throat is place of production of *h* and *visarjanīya*.

And, the commentator adds, they have no *karana*, or organ of production. As example of *h*, he cites *aharahar havirdhāninām* (ii.5.6<sup>3</sup>), but leaves *visarjanīya* uninstanced.

The other Prātiśākhyas give a corresponding definition of the utterance of these two sounds (see note to Ath. Pr. i.19). It is too indefinite to be of any particular use to us in determining their phonetic value. But the two rules which next follow in our treatise are very interesting and instructive.

उदयस्वरादिसंस्थानौ हकारं एकेषाम् ॥ ४७ ॥

47. In the opinion of some authorities, *h* has the same position as the beginning of the following vowel.

Our commentator first offers the simple paraphrase of this rule

45. *teshām ūshmanām karanamādhyam tu vivṛtam bhavati: sparśānām karanasāmyanivṛttiparas<sup>1</sup> tucabduh. karanānām madhyam karanamādhyam.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -*ttiyartham*.

46. *hakāravisarjanīyāu kaṇṭhasthānau syātām. kaṇṭha sthānam yayos tāu tathoktāu. anayoḥ karanābhāvah. ah-----.*

which he finds given by one of his three chief authorities, Vararuci, and then proceeds to exhibit his own superior acuteness by a very long, but not very important, discussion of it: a loose version is as follows:

The expression "the same position as the beginning," etc., implies a difference of position in the remainder of the vowel; but there is none such in *a*, *i*, *u*; as a vowel has but a single position, the word "beginning" is superfluous, and the desired result would be secured by saying simply "of the same position with the vowel." That is not so: a difference of position does in fact belong to the remainder of the diphthongs: the two rules (ii.28, 29) which teach that *i* and *u* form the final elements of *di* and *du* assure the difference of position for those two sounds; in like manner, a difference of position is to be remarked as prescribed in general grammar [though not in this treatise] for the final elements of *e* and *o*, they being included in the category of diphthongs. But again: even granting that, the utterance in the throat of this very *a* which makes the initial element of the diphthongs is taught by the rule, "the throat is the place of production of *a*, the *k*-mutes, *h*, and *visarjanīya*;" hence, as sameness of position [with the *a*, as throat-sound] is prescribed by the preceding rule, this rule is open to the charge of superfluous repetition. You must not think so, is the reply; there is a difference between the *a* which forms the beginning of *e* and *o* and an *a* standing by itself: to the latter belongs the description given above in rule 12, "the lips and jaws not too widely separated," etc.; to the other, that of rule 27, "with the organ of production more closed;" therefore, as place and organ correspond to one another, the expression "of the same position as the beginning" is to be understood as meaning "of the same place and organ as the beginning." Moreover, in the former rule the absence of an organ of production was taught, but here is implied also the presence of such; hence a difference of opinions comes to light, and not merely a superfluous repetition.

47. *ekeshām mate hakāra<sup>1</sup> udayasvarādisasthāna ātmāna upari svarādisasthāno<sup>2</sup> bhavati<sup>3</sup> 'ti vararucokta<sup>4</sup> syād etat. ādinā<sup>5</sup> sasthāna ity ukte geshasya sthānāntaratvam<sup>6</sup> vaktavyam tud cpy akārekārokāreshu nā<sup>7</sup> 'sti: <sup>8</sup> svarasyāi<sup>9</sup> "kam eva<sup>10</sup> "sthānum<sup>11</sup> ity ādigabdhavāyarthyam syāt: svarasasthāna<sup>12</sup> ity etāvati<sup>13</sup> 'vā 'rthasiddhir<sup>14</sup> iti: māi<sup>15</sup> 'vam: sandhyakshareshu geshasya<sup>16</sup> sthānāntaropapatteḥ: ikāro 'dhyardhaḥ (ii.28) iti sūtradhvayena geshabhātavarṇavyaktā<sup>17</sup> tayo<sup>18</sup> sthānāntaram api prasiddham eva: evam<sup>19</sup> ekārdukkārayor api vyākaraṇa<sup>20</sup> geshasya sthānāntaram vihitam vijñeyam: sandhyaksharatvaviśeṣād<sup>21</sup> anayoh. nanv evam apy akūhavisarjanīyānām kaṇṭha iti sandhyaksharādāv akārasyā<sup>22</sup> 'pi kaṇṭhassthānatvāt tena samānasthānatve<sup>23</sup> kathyamāne<sup>24</sup> pūrvasūtrokena<sup>25</sup> pūnaruktyam asya<sup>26</sup> sūtrasya*

Any detailed criticism of this cunning argument would certainly be open to the charge of superfluity, and I shall not attempt it.

A few further examples of the occurrence of *h*, before the various diphthongs, are added: *tigmahete* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), *yāvatiṛ vāsāmahāi* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>), *agnihotraṁ juhōti* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *samprayatiṛ ahaṁ* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>).

The acuteness of observation of the "some authorities" who have made this definition of the character of a *h* certainly deserves respectful, if not admiring, acknowledgment. It is the peculiarity of the aspiration, that it is an emission of unintonated breath through the same position of the mouth organs by which the following intonated sound receives its character: thus, the *h* of *ha* is a surd *a*, so to speak; that of *he*, a surd *e*; that of *who*, a surd *u*; that of *hue*, a surd *y*; and so on (see Journ. Am. Or. Soc'y, viii.370 seq.). The rule would have been made better by reading *udayasvarādi*, instead of *udayasvarādi*—'the following sound,' instead of 'the beginning of the following vowel'—for the assimilation is not less true of the semi-vowels and nasals than of the vowels.

## पूर्वतिसस्थानो विसर्जनीयः ॥ ४८ ॥

48. *Visarjanīya* has the same position as the end of the preceding vowel.

The commentator does not tell us whether this definition is to be looked upon as, like the preceding, expressing the opinion of "some authorities," or as having the unqualified approval of the Prāṭicākhya. From his silence we should infer the latter, but the connection gives reason for presuming the former. He paraphrases: "*visarjanīya* is of like position—that is, of like place and organ—with the end of the vowel that precedes itself;" and adds that

*syāt. māi 'vam maṁsthāh: ekādrūkārādivartino*<sup>19</sup> *'kārasya kevalasya ca vigesho 'sti: kevalasya*<sup>20</sup> *karaṇam oshṭhahanu nā 'tivyastam* (ii.12) *iti*<sup>21</sup>: *sandhyaksharādāu vartamānasya tu samvrtakaraṇataram* (ii.27): *tasmāt sthānakaraṇayoh saha-caritatvād*<sup>22</sup> *ādisasthāna ity ukta ādisamānasthānakaraṇa*<sup>23</sup> *iti vijñeyam. kim ca: pūrvasūtre karaṇābhāva ity*<sup>24</sup> *uktaḥ: atra tu karaṇavattvam apī*<sup>25</sup> *vidyata iti matāntaram upapadyate: na pāunaruktyaṁ ca. tathā*<sup>26</sup>: *tig: yāv-----: agn-----: sam-----: udayaṣabāda uttaraparyāyah*<sup>27</sup>: *udayaṣ cā 'sau*<sup>28</sup> *svaraṣ ca*<sup>29</sup>: *tasyā 'dih: tena sasthānaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ekeshām*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *udayasvar-*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *var-*. <sup>4</sup> W. *ādi*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *-taram*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *tathā satī*. <sup>(1)</sup> W. *'kashānam evam*. <sup>(2)</sup> B. om.  
<sup>9</sup> G. M. *svgrasya sa-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. *artha*; G. M. *-dāher*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *'-bhūtaṁ v-*.  
<sup>12</sup> G. M. *tasyā*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-na*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *sthā-*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *kalpy-*.  
<sup>17</sup> G. M. *-vok-*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *eva tasya*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *-rayor ādi-*. <sup>20</sup> W. ins. *tu*. <sup>21</sup> G. M.  
<sup>22</sup> *'tyupasanihṛtaṁ ca*; B. no *'pasanihṛtaṁ*. <sup>23</sup> W. B. *-ritvād*. <sup>24</sup> W. *-sthāna*.  
<sup>25</sup> G. M. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. om. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *udayasvarādisasthānaḥ*.  
<sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *asau*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. ins. *udayasvarāḥ*.



here too the language of the rule is aimed at the diphthongs, since no other vowel exhibits any difference of position between its end and its beginning. His examples, again, are only of *visarjanīya* after a diphthong: they are *agneḥ* (i.1.10<sup>3</sup> et al.), *brāhmanādir āyushmat* (ii.3.10<sup>3</sup>), *bāhuvor balam* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), and *ā'yaṁ gāruḥ* (i.5.3<sup>1</sup>). In the second and third of these passages, only the first word should have been quoted, in order to exhibit the *visarjanīya*.

The teachings of the other Prātiśākhyaś respecting the *visarjanīya* are rehearsed in the note to Ath. Pr. i.19. All are so indefinite as really to teach us nothing respecting the phonetic value of the sound. The present rule alone gives us positive and precise information, teaching us to regard it as, like the *h*, a simple uncharacterized breathing, a kind of final *h*.

## नासिक्या नासिकास्थानाः ॥ ४९ ॥

49. The nose-sounds have the nose as their place of production.

The "nose-sounds," the commentary says, are the *yamas* (xxi. 12, 13); but why the *nāsikya* (xxi. 14) should not be regarded as included among them I do not see. Any discussion of their phonetic character may be best deferred until the chapter where the rules for their occurrence are given. As examples of the nose-sounds are quoted *rukman antaram* (v.i.10<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. B. give instead *rukmantam*, ii.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *yācñā* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>: but G. M. give instead *rājñā*, ii.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.), *ātñārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>), *ratnam abhajanā* (ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. give instead, if it be not merely a corrupted reading, *uccā ratnam ayajanta*, which I have not found in the *Sanhitā*), and *pāpmānam* (i.4.41 et al.).

## मुखनासिक्या वा ॥ ५० ॥

50. Or they are produced by the mouth and nose.

Respecting this alternative explanation nothing need be said at present.

48. *visarjanīya ātmanah pūrvasvarāntena sasthanāḥ samānasthānakaraṇo bhavati: atrā'pi pūrvasvara iti sandhyaksharam ucyate: svarāntarasya<sup>1</sup> hi<sup>2</sup> sthānāntaratvābhāvāt. yathā: ag-<sup>3</sup> brāh-----: bāh-----<sup>4</sup> ā----- pūrvasyā 'ntaḥ: tena sasthanāḥ pūrvāntasasthanāḥ<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -ntasya. <sup>2</sup> B. om; G. M. bhinna. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om.

49. *nāsikyā yamā nāsikāsthānā bhavanti. yathā: ruk-----: yā: āṭ: rat-----: pāp.*

50. *ta<sup>1</sup> eva nāsikyā mukhanāsikābhyām<sup>2</sup> uccāranīyā bhavanti. mukham ca nāsikā<sup>3</sup> ca mukhanāsike<sup>4</sup>: tatsambandhīno mukhanāsikyāḥ. 'uktāny evo 'dāharanāni<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eta. <sup>2</sup> G. M. mukhena nāsikābhyām ca. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -ke. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -kam. <sup>5</sup> G. M. put after bhavanti.

## वर्गवच्चैषु ॥ ५१ ॥

51. And, in them, the organ of production is as in the series of mutes.

The "and" (*ca*) of this rule, the commentator says, brings forward, on the principle of 'the lion's look' (a distant glance backward: the phrase is used several times later in like cases), the already defined organs of production of the various mute series.

If the mouth be regarded as bearing a part in the production of the nose-sounds or *yamas*, in a way which is determined by the mode of formation of the mutes to which they are attached, it is difficult to see how their number can be restricted to four, as it is in the "list of sounds" given at the beginning of the treatise, and in the comment on rule xxi.12.

## नासिकाविवरणादानुनासिक्यं नासिकाविवरणादानु- नासिक्यम् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Nasal quality is given by the unclosing of the nose.

*Ānunāsikya* is the quality of being *anunāsika* or 'nasal;' and this name, as prescribed by rule 30, above, and fully supported by the usage of the treatise elsewhere, belongs to *anusvāra* and the various nasal consonants. The definition of the manner in which the quality is communicated is quite unexceptionable; the organs of the mouth remaining in the positions already given for the various classes and single sounds, the opening of the nasal passage, and the utterance through it of a part or the whole of the emitted material, makes the corresponding nasal sound.

The commentator explains *nāsikāvivarana* by *ghrāṇabala*, 'hole of the nose, nasal passage,' as if *vivarana* signified the opening or cavity, instead of the act of opening or unclosing. His choice of an example also seems to betray a want of appreciation of the true scope of the rule: it is *suṣṭokāśāñ sumanāgalāśāñ* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>).

51. *siṅhāvalokanena<sup>1</sup> vargasyo 'ktaṁ karaṇam cakāro 'nukar-  
shati: eshu<sup>2</sup> nāsikyeshu vargavat karaṇam bhavati. vargasye  
'va vargavat.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *kananyāyena*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. (as also in the text of the rule itself) *eteshu*.

52. *nāsikāvivaranaḍ ghrāṇabilāḍ ānunāsikyam raṅgāḍi kar-  
tavyam. yathā<sup>2</sup>: suṣ-... ity āḍi.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyavivarane  
dvitīyo 'dhyāyah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *nāsikāb*. <sup>2</sup> B. *tathā*; W. om.

## CHAPTER III.

CONTENTS: 1, introductory; 2-6, cases of *d* at the end of the first member of a compound, requiring to be shortened in divided text; 7, of *i* and *u*; 8-12, of final *d* of verbal forms and particles; 13-14, of final *i* and *u*; 15, of initial *d*.

## अथादावुत्तरे विभागे ऋस्वं व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now then—at the beginning or end of a word, a vowel, in case of separation, if followed by a consonant, becomes short as hereinafter set forth.

Matters of introductory explanation, of interpretation of the rules of the treatise, and of phonetic theory, being now for the present disposed of (for they are resumed, in a supplementary way, in some of the concluding chapters), the task of determining the readings of the *Sanhitā* is taken up. And the first subject dealt with is that of the irregular prolongations of vowels—chiefly final *a*, *i*, and *u*—which are so frequent in all the Vedic texts. In the other treatises (*Rik* Pr. vii.-ix., *Vāj.* Pr. iii.95-128, *Ath.* Pr. iii.1-25), the rules tell us in what situations a vowel originally short is lengthened: this is more in accordance with the general method of the *Prātiśākhya*s, which take for granted, upon the whole, the existence of their *śākhās* in the analyzed condition of the *pada*-text, and proceed to construct the *sanhitā* from it. Here, on the contrary, we are told what vowels, long in the ordinary text, are to be shortened when thrown out of combination with their surroundings. Such dissolution of the continuity of the text takes place, first, in *pada*, whenever a pause—either the *avagraha* separating the two members of a compound, in its repetition after *iti*, or the longer pause that divides between two words—comes to stand between the vowel in question and the consonant which was its next neighbor in *sanhitā*: thus, *devāyata iti deva-yate*; *avanah* (s. *avā nah*). Second, it is made in the so-called *jaṭā*-text, examples of which are often quoted in the sequel, and to which the rules of the treatise are in more than one instance adapted; this text is constructed by thrice repeating each pair of words—first in

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ādāu padādāv uttare padānte ca vartamānaḥ sanhitāyām yo dīrgho 'sau vibhāge vibhāgasamaye vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate: ' vyañjanaparatvam' atra yathāsanhitāsthān vijñeyam. nanu dīrghaḥ kathān labhyate. 'hrasvānantarabhāvītvd devāśīkā (iii.2) "dīgrahaneshu plutādarśanāc ce' 'ti brūmaḥ. sanhitāyām ity asyā 'yam arthaḥ: kāryabhājaḥ padasyo 'ttarapadena saha sambandhaniyamaḥ: na tu pūrvapadena saha sambandhaniyamaḥ. vibhāgo 'tra*

their natural order, then inverted, then in the natural order again: for example, *āpo heśhā māyobhuvah* would become *āpo hi hy āpa āpo hi: hi śhā śhā hi hi śhā: śhā māyobhuvo māyobhuva śhā śhā māyobhuvah: māyobhuva iti mayah-bhuvah*: the treatment of the *ā* of *śhā* here illustrates the conditions of the restoration of the short vowel in such cases. Third, the same restoration takes place in the *samhitā*-text of the existing manuscripts and in the edition founded upon them, when the lengthened vowel happens to come at the end of one of those passages, of just fifty words each, into which the *anuvākas* or sections of the *Samhitā* are divided. This division the *Prāticākhyā* does not recognize—or, at any rate, does not notice—not infrequently quoting in *sandhi*, without remark, words which are separated by it (for example, under rule 13, below, *uṇmasi gamadhye*, i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>, where the edited text reads correctly *uṇmasi: 1: gamadhye*).

The comment upon this rule may be loosely translated, or paraphrased, as follows:

Here *atha*, 'now then,' is an introductory heading; *ādau* [literally, 'at the beginning'] means 'at the beginning of a word' [including, also, a separable part of a compound word]; *uttare* [literally, 'in the latter part'] means 'at the end of a word:' a vowel occupying such a position, if it be long in *samhitā*, becomes short *vibhāge*, i. e. 'in case of separation,' when followed by a consonant—that is to say, when so followed in *samhitā*. But whence is derived the limitation to a "long" vowel? We answer, from its conversion into a short, and from the non-occurrence of any protracted (*plūta*) vowels among the instances included in the rules. The limitation "in *samhitā*" implies that the word whose form is in question is placed in euphonic connection with the word that follows it; not, however, with the word that precedes it [unless, as should be excepted, its initial vowel, instead of its final, is the one liable to change of quantity]. "Separation" (*vibhāga*) is to be understood as division from the words with which it stands in natural or original connection—that is, according to the reading of the fundamental text: otherwise, in the *jaṭā*-text of the two words *śhā māyobhuvah* (see above), the *śhā* would retain its long *ā* in its second repetition, because of its standing in euphonic connection with the following word: and that should not be so. The sense of the word *vibhāga* is, in case of a long initial vowel, separation from the preceding word; in case of a long final, from the

*prakṛtipaddāir. ucyate: prakṛtir nāma yathāpāthah: prakṛtipaddāir iti kim: śhā m- ity atra jaṭāyān sthaṇḍasya dvitīyocodrane 'pi dīrghah prasajyeta: uttarapadena vibhāgābhāvāt: sa mā bhūd iti parihārah. vibhāgapadasyā 'yam arthah: padādau' dīrghasya pūrvapadena vibhāgah: padānte dīrghasyo 'ttarapadena vibhāgah. vibhāge vyañjanapara iti kim: ṛt---- ity atra mā bhūd iti: nādhamādhārayā (iii.8) iti prāptih. samhitāyān<sup>12</sup> dīrgha iti kim: eśha---- ity atra prāptisampādanārtham:*

following word. The limitation "in case of separation, if followed by a consonant" is for the sake of excluding such cases as *ṛtadhā-mā 'si* (i.3.3: in separated form, *ṛtadhāmā. asi*), which would otherwise come under the rule iii.8 [among the specifications of which, *dhāmā* is included]. The limitation "a long vowel in *saṁhitā*" is intended to bring *esha vo bharatā rājā* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup> et al.; *pada*-text, *bharatāh*) under the action of the rules; since thus, and not otherwise, is pertinence given to the word *yājyā* in rule 11 of this chapter. Undue extension of the prescription to such cases as *tvā vāyavaḥ* (i.1.1) is provided against by the rules that follow [since these specify all the cases in which it is to be applied].

The only difficulty arising in connection with the understanding of this rule, or of the interpretation of it given by the commentator, grows out of the specification *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant.' Respecting this, we are explicitly told, near the beginning of the exposition, "the being followed by a consonant is to be understood here of the condition of things in the *saṁhitā*-text"—that is to say, any long vowel which appears in *saṁhitā* as a final, with a consonant following it, is to be regarded as falling under the rules of the chapter. This specification, then, makes the rules apply to such cases as *bharatā rājā* (the example quoted by the commentator: the *pada*-reading is *bharatāh: rājā*) and *adhā mā* (quoted under rule 9; *pada*-reading *adhāh: mā*), and they have to be specially allowed for and excepted—as is done in rules 9 and 11. It seems very strange, now, to have this implication made, requiring as a consequence that all the words which by euphonic processes come to exhibit in *saṁhitā* a long final vowel (*ā*) should be taken into consideration: but the number of cases actually needing to be guarded against in the rules on account of it is very small. For, in the first place, the question can arise only in regard to the words specially mentioned in the rules; and among these there are not many for which homophonous forms in *āh* or *āi* occur; and of these, again, only a part would occur otherwise than before a vowel, in which situation the hiatus would betray the omission of the former final element. The makers of the treatise, then, appear to have thought it safer to avoid a possible confusion of *adhā* from *adhāh* with *adhā* from *adha*, and so on, by making the rules apply in general to both cases, and specially excepting the former. And this is what they have attempted to do: and it has cost them only two additional words—*agnīyā-jye* in rule 9, and *yājyāsu* in rule 11—together with an artifice of

*tathā sati bharatā yājyāsu* (iii.11) *iti yājyāpadāni sārthakam nā 'nyathā. vyañjanam asmāt param*<sup>12</sup> *iti vyañjanaparāh. tvā . . . ity ādāv etallakṣaṇasambhavād*<sup>14</sup> *ativyāptim*<sup>15</sup> *uttara-sūtrāḥ pariharati.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padādau ca padānte ca yo dirgho vyañjanottaro vibhāge kriyamāṇe hrasvaṇi saṁyāti.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. -nam. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.; G. hrasvānt-. <sup>4</sup> G. om. ca. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -āhah. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -yate. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -gaṇabā-. <sup>10</sup> W. -ādāi. <sup>11</sup> W. -nā. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *yo.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. -ra. <sup>14</sup> G. M. eva tal-. <sup>15</sup> W. atiprā-.

construction under rule 8, in connection with the word *prānāh*. Without a complete *index verborum* to the *Sanhitā*, or a laboriously minute examination of the whole text with reference to this particular point, I cannot tell just how nearly successful their attempt has been; but I have, I believe, discovered at least one case which they have overlooked. At i.4.24, namely, we read *rakshā mākih* (p. *rakshāh*), and, by rule 8, the *ā* of *rakshā* should be shortened. That the section containing these words was really a part of the text for which the *Prātiçākhyā* was constructed is proved by the fact that two of its peculiarities of reading are provided for in later rules (vi.5 and xi.13).

But with the interpretation thus given appears to be quite at variance the phrase containing the illustration *ṛtadhāmā'si*, where *vibhāge* and *vyañjanaparaḥ* are immediately connected, and made to mean 'followed by a consonant in separated text' (not *ṛtadhāmā: asi*). This I can hardly believe to be a genuine part of the commentary. The second *ā* of *ṛtadhāmā'si* cannot be said to be either final or initial: it is a combination of both: it does not furnish a case to which the rules of the chapter apply with any propriety, as the *saṁhitā* reading cannot be affected by them. If not some later meddler, then the commentator himself, has suffered himself to be scared by an imaginary difficulty, and has unnecessarily twisted the rule a little awry in order to its removal.

The specification *vibhāge*, 'in case of separation,' applies in the *Tāittirīya pada*-text more generally and more strictly than in those of the other Vedas. Where the separation of a compound is suspended on account of its further composition, the restoration of its natural form is suspended also; and we read, for example, *vīrya-vat*, but *vīryāvat-tara*; *viçva-mitra*, but *viçvāmitra-jamadagnī*; *anu-yāja* and *ananu-yāja*, but *prayāja-anāyāja*, and so on—and we shall find illustrations hereafter in connection with other changes than prolongation of vowels. Thus, also, in the full *pada*-readings, the word is given first, before *iti*, in its *saṁhitā* form, without change (except euphonic combination with the *iti*); and this part of the reading I shall accordingly usually omit in quoting the *pada*-text, setting down only the separated and restored form which follows *iti*, or the part which corresponds to the entire reading of the *Rik* and *Atharvan pada*-texts.

देवाशीकासुम्नाश्चर्तावयुनाहृदयाघोक्त्याशुद्धा ॥ २ ॥

2. *Devā, śikā, sumnā, çvā, ṛtā, vayunā, hr̥dayā, aghā,*

2. ----- *ity eteshu grahaneshv avagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: dev-----: śīk-----: sumn-----: dyāv-----: <sup>2</sup>apy akarādi (i.52) iti vacanād<sup>3</sup> idam apy udāharanam<sup>4</sup>: açv-----: ṛt-----: vay-----: hr̥d-----: agh-----: ukt<sup>5</sup>h-----: āpo-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *sūtrād* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-hārtavyam*.

*ukthā*, and *śuddhā*, as first members of a compound, shorten their final when separated.

This and the following rules, including the seventh, properly form one connected passage, with the specification *ity avagrahaḥ*, 'these, as former members of a compound,' which applies alike to them all, standing at the end.

The examples quoted from the *Sanhitā* in illustration of the rule are as follows. For *devā*: *devāyate yajamānāya śarma* (iii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation), the only case, so far as I have noted, for *devāyant*; we have *devayate* (with short vowel) twice, at i.2.12<sup>3</sup> and ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>; *devāyuvam* occurs ii.5.9<sup>6</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>, but *devayuh*, iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>. For *śikā*, *śikāyate svāhā* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *śumnā*, *śumnāyanto havdmake* (i.5.11<sup>4</sup>), also alone. For *śvā*, *dyāvāprthivya śvāvīt* (v.5.20): *śvā*, however, by rule i.52, includes *aśvā*, for which is quoted *aśvāvatīṅ somavatīm* (iv.2.6<sup>4</sup>); I have noted farther only iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>, but feel less than usual confidence in the completeness of my excerpt. For *rtā*, *rtāyavaḥ purā nnam akṣan* (ii.2.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last word of the citation): there are more than twenty such cases in the text, for the themes *rtāyu* (e. g. i.4.5: but *rtayu* once, ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>), *rtāyant* (e. g. iv.2.9<sup>3</sup>), *rtāvan* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>2</sup>) and its feminine *rtāvarī* (e. g. i.1.3), *rtāvrah* (e. g. i.4.5), and *rtāsaḥ* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: but this word reads in *pada* as in *sanhitā*). For *vayunā*, *vayunāvid eka it* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>). For *hrdayā*, *hrdayāvidhaḥ cit* (i.4.45<sup>1</sup>). For *aghā*, *aghāyavo mā gandharvo viśvāvasur ādadhat* (i.2.9: G. M. omit after *gandharvāḥ*): other cases of *aghāyu* are found at iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>; 5.10<sup>4</sup>: v.7.3<sup>1</sup>; and of *aghāyant*, ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. For *ukthā*, *ukthāmadānām dhenuḥ* (ii.4.11<sup>6</sup>): the same compound occurs again at iii.3.2<sup>1</sup> and v.6.8<sup>6</sup>, and *ukthāyu* at i.4.12, twice. For *śuddhā*, *āpo devīḥ śuddhāyuvāḥ* (i.3.8<sup>2</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>4</sup>).

### इन्द्रा वदन्वान्तरः ॥३॥

3. Also *indrā*, when followed by *vat*, *van*, and *vān*.

One example is quoted by the commentator for each of the three cases enumerated: *indrāvatīm apacitīm iḥā vāha* (v.7.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *apacitīm*), *indrāvanto marutaḥ* (iv.7.14<sup>1</sup>), and *indrāvānt svāhā* (i.1.12); and I have noted no others. As counter-examples, he quotes: first, to show that not every long *ā* is to be shortened before the three syllables named, *ūrṇāvantam prathamā śida yonim* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. give only the first two words), *asura prajāvān* (iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but B. reads, I presume only by an

3. *indre* 'ty *asminn*' *avagrahe* 'ntyasvaro vad van vān ity evamparo vibhāge hrasvam āpadyate. yathā': *ind*-----: *ind*-----: *ind*----- *indre* 'ti *kim*: *ūrṇ*-----: *as*-----: *praj*----- *evampara it*: *kim*: *ind*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*.

error, *pratāpavān*), and *prajāvatir anamivā ayakshmaḥ* (i.1.1: but omitted in G. M.); second, to show that *indrā* is not altered except under the circumstances specified, *indravarunayor aham* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>). This last is a case in which no *vibhāga*, or 'separation,' would be made in any text of the other Vedas; but the *Tāittiriya pada* reads *indravarunayor itī 'ndrā-varunayoḥ*, and the example is therefore to the purpose.

## चित्रा वपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also *citrā*, when followed by *v*.

The illustrative passage cited is *citrāvaso svasti te pāram aḥya* (i.5.5<sup>4</sup> and 7<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit after *te*). As counter-examples, are given *mitrāvarunāv eva* (ii.1.7<sup>3</sup> et al.: p. *mitrā-varunāu*), and *citrāpārnāmāse dīksheran* (vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>)—the former to show the necessity of the restriction to *citrā*, the latter, of the restriction to sequence by a *v*. I have found no farther instances falling under the rule.

## प्रस्येन्द्रियाद्रविणाविश्वदेव्यादीर्घावीर्याविश्ववातावा- भङ्गुराकर्णकावृष्णिपासुगोपकसामाघासत्रावर्षाष्षामि- घाप्रास्वा ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also *prasthā*, *indriyā*, *draviṇā*, *viṣvadevyā*, *dirghā*, *vīryā*, *viṣvā*, *vātā*, *tvā*, *bhaṅgurā*, *karnakā*, *vṛshniyā*, *sugopā*, *rksāmā*, *aghā*, *satrā*, *varshā*, *pushpā*, *meghā*, *prā*, *svā*.

For each of these words, the commentator cites a single example. For *prasthā*, *prasthāvad rathavāhanam* (iv.2.5<sup>6</sup>), the only case. For *indriyā*, *indriyāvate purodācam* (ii.2.7<sup>1</sup>): half a dozen cases of this word occur in the text, and several of *indriyāvin* (e.g. i.6.2<sup>4</sup>: ii.1.6<sup>3</sup>: vi.2.10<sup>6</sup>); the latter word, however, is not separated in the *pada*-text. For *draviṇā*, *draviṇāvataḥ kurute* (v.3.11<sup>2</sup>), the only case. For *viṣvadevyā*, *viṣvadevyāvate svātrāḥ* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>): the word occurs also at iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup>. For *dirghā*, *dirghādhiyo rakshamānāḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), the only case. For *vīryā*, *vīryāvantam abhimāti-shāham* (i.2.7): the same theme is found in other passages, as are also its comparative, *vīryāvat-tara* (e.g. i.7.6<sup>3</sup>), and superlative, *vīryāvat-tama* (ii.4.2<sup>1</sup>), in which the shortening of the *ā* is not authorized by the *Prāticākhya*, since, in the division, it does not stand next before the pause: and the *pada*-text reads accordingly. For *viṣvā*, *viṣvāmitrasya sūktam bhavati* (v.2.3<sup>3,4</sup>: G. M. omit

4. *citrā ity asminn' avagrahe 'ntyasvaro vakāraparo' vibhāge hrasvam āpadyate. yathā'*: *cit----- citre 'ti kim: mitr----- vapara iti kim: citr-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasminn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vap-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*.



the last word): the same word occurs in other passages (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>; v.2.3<sup>3,4</sup>, 10<sup>5</sup>; 4.2<sup>2</sup>), as also in the compound *viçvāmitra-jamadagnī* (v.4.11<sup>3</sup>), where, as the division is *viçvāmitra-jamadagnī*, the *ā* is not shortened; and we have further the themes *viçvāvasu* (e. g. i.1.11<sup>1</sup>), *viçvāvant* (iii.5.6<sup>2</sup>), *viçvārāj* (i.3.2<sup>1</sup>), and *viçvāsah* (i.4.17; p. *viçva-sāham*). For *vātā*, *vātāvad varshan* (ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), the only case. For *tvā*, *tvāvato maghonah* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; p. *tva-vatah*): the Rik *pada*-text does not shorten the *ā* of this word. For *bhañgurā*, *bhettāram bhañgurāvatah* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> and iv.1.2<sup>5</sup>). For *karnakā*, *sūrmī karnakāvaty etayā* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> and v.4.7<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *vṛshniyā*, *vṛshniyāvatas tava* (iii.5.6<sup>2-3</sup>). For *sugopā*, *sa sugopātamo janah* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *sugopata-mah*: G. M. omit the first word): the Rik *pada* writes *su-gopā-tamah*. For *ṛksāmā*, *ṛksāmābhyām yajushā* (i.2.3<sup>3</sup> and iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>). For *aghā*, *aghāçvād evāi nam antar eti bhātam* (iii.1.7<sup>2</sup>; p. *agha-çvāt*: G. M. omit the last two words); the Rik and Atharvan *pada*-texts write *agha-çva*: the themes *aghāyu* (e. g. i.2.9<sup>1</sup>) and *aghāyant* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>) are also found in the Samhitā. For *satrā*, *satrājītam dhanajītam* (iv.1.1<sup>3</sup>; p. *satra-jītam*: the word *satrā* occurs repeatedly (e. g. i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) uncompounded, and maintains its long final in the *pada*-text also. For *varshā*, *varshāhvām juhōti* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>; p. *varsha-hvām*). For *pushpā*, *pushpavatīh supippalāh* (iv.1.4<sup>4</sup> and v.1.5<sup>10</sup>). For *meghā*, *meghāyate svāhā* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; p. *meghayate*; in the same division occurs also *meghāyishyate*, which is not divided: *meghayantī* is found at iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>). For *prā*, *prāvanebbih sajoshasah* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *pra-vanebbih*); the Rik *pada*-text writes this word *pravana*, without separation: other words beginning with *prā* are *prāsuh* (e. g. i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *pra-sahā*), *prāçrñga* (ii.1.34<sup>5</sup>), *prāsaca* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; not divided in *pada*-text), *prākāça* (i.8.18; also not divided), and *prāvṛta* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup> et al.; also not divided). And for *svā*, *svādhiyam janayat sūdayac ca* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>; p. *sva-dhiyam*): but this the Rik *pada*-text writes *su-ādhiyam*.

## लोकएवेश ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also *ishṭā*, after *loke* and *eva*.

The commentator cites the two cases: *sam amushmiñ loka ishṭāpārtena* (iii.3.8<sup>5</sup> twice: G. M. omit the first word), and *sa tv eve ishṭāpārte* (i.7.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *ishṭā-pārte*). Then, to show that *ishṭā* after other words remains unchanged, he quotes *prati jāgrhy enam ishṭāpārte sañ srjethām ayan ca* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>; p. *ishṭā-pārte*: W. B.

5. .... ity eteshv avagraheshv antyasvuro vibhāge byañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: pras-....: indr-....: drav-....: viçv-....: dir-....: vīr-....: viçv-....: vāt-....: tvā-....: bhett-....: sūr-....: vṛsh-....: sa-....: ṛks-....: agh-....: satr-....: varsh-....: pushp-....: megh-....: prāv-....: svā-....

omit before *enam*, G. M. after *-pārte*); and the same mode of treatment is followed by the *pada*-text at v.7.7<sup>2</sup>, which is the only other case I have noted. The ground of this difference does not appear. To show, further, that only *ishtā* shortens its *ā* in the defined position, the passage *sākshād eva prajāpataye* (v.1.2<sup>5</sup>) is given.

शक्तीरथीविषीवाशीरात्र्योषध्याद्धृतीव्याहृतीस्वाहा-  
कृतीह्रादुनीशचीचितीश्रोणीपृष्टीपूत्यभीचर्षणीपर्यधीपा-  
रीशत्रूविषूवसूअनूहनूसूविभू इत्यवग्रहः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Also *çakti*, *rathî*, *tvishî*, *vâçî*, *râtrî*, *oshadhî*, *âhuti*, *vyâhrtî*, *svâhâkrtî*, *hrâdunî*, *çaci*, *citi*, *gronî*, *prshî*, *pûti*, *abhî*, *carshanî*, *parî*, *adhî*, *pârî*, *çâtrû*, *vishû*, *vasû*, *arû*, *hanû*; *sû*, *vibhû*—all these, as first members of a compound.

To the passages cited by the commentator I add, as above, notice of other cases which I have found in the text. For *çakti*, the sole instance is *çaktivanto gâbhîrâh* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *rathî*, *rathî-tamâu rathînâm* (iv.7.15<sup>3</sup>). For *tvishî*, *saspiñjarâya tvishîmate pathînâm* (iv.5.2<sup>1</sup>; W. B. omit the last word, G. M. the first). For *vâçî*, *te vâçimanta ishminah* (ii.1.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>; G. M. omit the last word). For *râtrî*, *râtrîbhir asubhnan* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>): if there are other cases, I have failed to note them. For *oshadhî*, *oshadhîbhyo vehatam dlabheta* (ii.1.5<sup>3</sup>; G. M. omit the last word): I have noted half a dozen other cases, but they are not worth reporting. For *âhuti*, *âhutiḥbhir anâyâjeshu* (ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>). For *vyâhrtî*, *etâbhir vyâhrtîbhiḥ* (i.6.10<sup>2</sup> and v.5.5<sup>3</sup>). For *svâhâkrtî*, *svâhâkrtîbhyah preshye 'ty âha* (vi.3.9<sup>5</sup>; G. M. omit the last two words). For *hrâdunî*, *svâhâ hrâdunîbhyah svâhâ* (vii.4.13; G. M. omit the first word, W. B. the last). For *çaci*, *viçvâ rūpâ 'bhi cashte çacîbhiḥ* (iv.2.5<sup>4-5</sup>; W. B. omit before *cashte*). For *citi*, *citîbhyam upâyan* (v.7.5<sup>7</sup>). For *gronî*, *gronîbhyâñ svâhâ* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>): another case is found at v.7.15. For *prshî*, W. B. give *prshîbhir divam* (v.7.17), but G. M. read *prshîbhyah svâhâ* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *pûti*, *pâtigandhasyâ 'pahatyâi* (ii.2.2<sup>4</sup>). For *abhî*, *abhîvrtô ghrñî-vân cetati tmanâ* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>; G. M. omit the last two words): we have also *abhîshah* at iii.2.2<sup>6</sup> (p. *abhî-sahâ*). For *carshanî*, *naitrasya carshanâdhrtah* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>): another case at i.4.16. For *parî*, *vîravantam parînasam* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>; p. *pari-nasam*: compare rule vii.4). For *adhî*, *adhîvâsam yâ hîranyâny asmâi* (iv.6.9<sup>2</sup>; G. M. omit the last word). For *pârî*, *pârînahyasye 'ce* (vi.2.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *pârî-nahyasya*: compare rule vii.4). For *çâtrû*, *ça-*

6. *loke: evâ: ity evampârva ishte 'ty asmin' grahaṇe' ntya-svaro vibhâge vyañjanaparo hrasvam âpadyate. yathâ: sa m----- sa----- evampârva iti kim: prati----- ishte 'ti kim: sâk-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmîn*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *avagrahe*.

*trāyato hantā* (i.6.5<sup>3</sup> and iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>). For *viśhā*, *viśhāvan* *viśhāvan-  
taḥ* (vii.4.3<sup>4</sup>): another case at vii.4.8<sup>2</sup>. For *vasū*, *aramatir vasū-  
yuh* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>). For *anū*, *anūrādḥā nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>2</sup>); we  
have it also in the compounds *anūyāja* (e. g. ii.6.9<sup>4</sup>), *anūbandhya*  
(e. g. ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>), *anākāṣa* (e. g. v.4.1<sup>3</sup>), and *anūvrj* (v.7.23). In the  
further compound of the first, *prayājānūyāja* (e. g. i.7.1<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-  
yāja-anūyājān*), the shortening is not authorized, since in it there is  
no division after *anu*. Appealing to rule i.53 as his authority, the  
commentator adds, as contemplated by the present rule, *ananū-  
yājam prayānīyam* (vi.1.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *anamu-yājam*). For *hanū*, *hanū-  
bhyān svāhā* (vii.3.16<sup>1</sup>). For *sū*, *sūyavasini manave yaṣasye*  
(i.2.13<sup>2</sup>): *sūyavasa* occurs more than once (e. g. i.7.5<sup>2,3</sup>). For  
*vibhā*, *vibhādāve* (iii.5.8,9<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator notes that the specification at the end of this  
rule defines the whole mass of words thus far enumerated as col-  
lectively *avagraha* (i.49), 'first members of compounds.'

अवासचस्वानुदामृडावर्धाशिक्क्षारक्षायभवाभजायत्रा-  
चरपिबानाधामाधर्याधर्षाधावर्धयाबोधात्रातत्रामुच्चाश्च-  
स्यापृणस्वादिष्ठावतराजनिधायुद्वाह ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also *ava*, *sacasvā*, *nudā*, *mṛdā*, *vardhā*, *ṣikshā*, *rakshā*,  
*adyā*, *bhavā*, *bhajā*, *yatrā*, *carā*, *pibā*, *nā*, *dhāmā*, *dhārayā*,  
*dharshā*, *ghā*, *vardhayā*, *bodhā*, *atrā*, *tatrā*, *muñcā*, *aṣvasyā*,  
*prnasvā*, *hi shīhā*, *tvaṁ tarā*, *janishvā*, *yukshvā*, *achā*.

Henceforth we have to do only with independent words, the cate-  
gory of *avagrahas*, or former members of compounds, having been  
exhausted by the foregoing rules. There is cited in illustration,  
for *avā*, *avā no devyā kṛpā* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>). For *sacasvā*, *sacasvā  
naḥ svastaye* (i.5.6<sup>2</sup>). For *nudā*, *prā nudā naḥ sapatnān* (iv.3.12<sup>1</sup>  
thrice, and v.3.5<sup>1</sup>). For *mṛdā*, W. B. give *mṛdā jaritre* (iv.5.10<sup>4</sup>),  
but G. M. read *mṛdā no rudra* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other  
case. For *vardhā*, *vardhā no amavac chavaḥ* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *ṣik-*

7. ----- *ity eteshv avagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañja-  
naparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: ṣak-----: rath-----: sa-----:  
te-----: rā-----: śsh-----: āh-----: et-----: svā-----: svā-  
hā-----: viṣ-----: cit-----: grō-----: prśh-----: pāt-----:  
abh-----: mitr-----: vīr-----: adh-----: pār-----: ṣatr-----:  
vish-----: ar-----: anū-----: ankārādi ca<sup>2</sup> (i.53) iti vacanād<sup>3</sup>  
anan----- ity etad<sup>4</sup> udāharanam bhavati: han-----: sūy-----:  
vibh-----: ity avagraha ity anena prakāreṇo 'ktiḥ<sup>5</sup> padasam-  
udāye<sup>6</sup> 'vagraho vijñeyah<sup>7</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. sūtrāt. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. apy. <sup>5</sup> G. M. 'ktaḥ.  
<sup>6</sup> G. M. -muccayah. <sup>7</sup> B. vīṣeshah.

*shā, śikshā no asmin puruhāta yāmani* (vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last two words): it is found again at iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>. For *rakshā, rakshā ca no adhi ca deva brūhi* (iv.5.10<sup>3</sup> and vii.5.24; G. M. omit the last two words): the form occurs also at ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>. I have pointed out in the note to the first rule of the chapter that a passage (i.4.24) in which *rakshā* appears as euphonic alteration of *rakshāh* before a sonant consonant ought to be somehow excepted here. For *adyā, adyā devān jushtatamaḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>5</sup>): also at ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: iii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>. For *bhavā, bhavā pāyur viṣo asyā adabādhāḥ* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words): other cases are not infrequent; see i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 4.32: iii.2.5<sup>3</sup>; 4.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>; 2.5<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>4</sup>; 4.4<sup>7</sup>; and likewise ii.6.12<sup>1</sup>, where *bhavā*, standing at the end of the first division of the *anuvāka*, is situated *vibhāge*, and loses its *ā* even in the *samhitā*-text. For *bhajā, ā gomati vraje bhajā tvam naḥ* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>: W. B. begin at *vraje*): another case at iii.3.9<sup>2</sup>. For *yatrā, yatrā naro marutaḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>): other cases at iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; 6.6<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *carā, pra carā soma duryān* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>). For *pibā, pibā somam indra mandatu* (ii.4.14<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): another case at i.4.19. For *nā, ripavo nā ha debhuh* (i.2.14<sup>5-6</sup>): in connection with this word, the commentator runs off into a lengthy discussion, which I defer to the end of the note. For *dhamā, dhāmā ha yat te ajara* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>): we have *dhamā*, plural, in *samhitā* also, at iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>; 7.13<sup>4</sup>. For *dhārayā, brhaspate dhārayā vasāni* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> and vi.3.6<sup>1</sup>): other cases at iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>. For *dharshā*, W. B. have *dharshā mānushān adbhyah* (i.3.8<sup>1</sup>), but G. M., *dharshā mānushān iti nī yunakti* (vi.3.6<sup>3</sup>). For *ghā, uta vā ghā syālāt* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>): there is another case, if my manuscript reads correctly, at iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>. For *vardhayā, tam agne vardhayā tvam* (iv.6.3<sup>1</sup>): other cases are at i.5.5<sup>2</sup>; iv.2.4<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>5</sup>. For *bodhā, bodhā no asya vacaso yavishtha* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words). For *atrā, atrā te rūpam* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>): other cases are at iv.6.7<sup>2</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>. For *tatrā, tatrā ratham upa śagmam* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>). For *muñcā, pra muñcā svastaye* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>): again at iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>. For *aśvasyā, ekas tvash-tur aśvasyā vigastā* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *prnasvā, sapta yonir ā prnasvā ghrtena* (i.5.3<sup>3</sup> and iv.6.5<sup>5</sup>). For *sthā* after *hi, āpo hi shihā mayobhuvah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>); and, as counter-example, to show that the correction takes place only after *hi*, *pratiśthā vā ekaviñśah* (v.2.3<sup>6</sup> et al.). For *tarā* after *tvam, agne tvam tarā mrdhah* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *antaratarā taptuvrato bhavati* (vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *janishvā, janī-*

8. ----- <sup>1</sup> *eteshv anavagraheshv antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjana-paro hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: avā-----: sac-----: pra-----: mṛ-----: var-----: śiksh-----: rak-----: adyā-----: bhav-----: ā go-----: yat-----: pra-----: pibā-----: rip-----: api vikṛtam* (i.51) *apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti dvābhyām<sup>2</sup> vacandbhyām prā----- ity atra hrasvādeṣaḥ kim na syāt: māi<sup>3</sup> 'vam: api vikṛtam* (i.51) *iti vacanam kaṇṭhoktapadavishayam<sup>3</sup> na tv akārādīpadavishayam<sup>3</sup>: prāṇā<sup>4</sup> ' ity asyā<sup>4</sup> 'py akārādītvaṇ nā*

*shvā hi jenyō agne* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup> and v.1.4<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *agne*). For *yukshvā*, *yukshvā hi devahūtamān* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup> et al.): other cases at iv.2.9<sup>5</sup>: v.5.3<sup>1,2</sup>. For *achā*, *achā nakshī dyumattamah* (i.5.6<sup>3</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>3</sup>): other cases at i.7.10<sup>2</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>: 6.11<sup>1</sup>: iv.2.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.4<sup>2</sup> (if my MS. is correct; the Rik reads *acha*); 5.1<sup>2</sup>: 6.7<sup>5</sup>: but the compound *achāvāka* (vii.1.5<sup>5</sup>) is left undivided and unchanged.

The occasion of the commentator's delay and discussion over the word *nā* is given by the fact that the *pada*-text of the Tāittirīya Sanhitā (unlike that of the Rik and Atharvan: see note to Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides the word *prānāḥ* thus: *pra-anāḥ*. Hence, when we read in the Sanhitā, as in the passage which he quotes, *prānā vā añçavaḥ* (vi.4.4<sup>4</sup>: W. B. read simply *prānā vāi*, which occurs in various other places; e. g. v.3.8<sup>2</sup>), he fears that, having this division in mind, we shall be misled into believing that the specification *nā* of the present rule applies to *prānā*, because we are taught in the first chapter (i.51,52) that a word cited in any rule comes equally under that rule when phonetically altered, or preceded by *a*. He sets aside this difficulty, however, by the arbitrary *dictum* that it is not permitted to vary the same word in both ways at once—that we may accept the altered form only of a vocable which is actually quoted entire, not of one made by the prefixion of an *a* to one so quoted: hence, he infers, the present rule does not apply to [the *anā* of] *prānā*, as it begins with *a*. But a further objection is interposed: in that case, why does it not apply to the part *anā* of the compound, in which is no altered *n*? He replies, because of the absence of a long vowel in *samhitiā*, in a word wearing this form—or, as would seem a better statement, because of the absence of any such word in *samhitiā* as *anā* (for *anāḥ*) with a long vowel as its final. The second objection, in fact, is a wholly futile one, scarcely worth the trouble of bringing up and setting aside. The original difficulty is one growing out of the extension of the leading rule in the chapter to cases of final *ā* in *samhitiā* where a *visarjanīya* has been lost after it (see note to rule 1). The answer has a somewhat quibbling aspect, but the rule of interpretation which it involves is in accordance with that adopted in one or two analogous cases elsewhere.

## अध्यामियास्ये ॥ १ ॥

9. Also *adhā*, in *agni* and *yājyā* passages.

*'yam vidhiḥ. tarhi vikṛtatvābhāvād' anā ity asye' 'ngyāñçasya'*  
*kim na syād ayaṁ vidhiḥ. evamrūpasya samhitiāyām dirghābhā-*  
*vāt. dhā-----: brh-----: dhar-----: uta-----: tam-----: bo-*  
*dhā-----: ātrā-----: tat-----: pra-----: ek-----: sap-----:*  
*āpo-----: hē 'ti kim: pra-----: agne-----: tvam itī kim:*  
*ant-----: jan-----: yuk-----: achā-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. -*ktip*; B. om. *pada*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. *pada*. <sup>5</sup> W. ins. *vā*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vāikṛtasyā bh-*. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. -*yāç*.

The commentator's first care is to define what parts of the Sanhitā are styled *agni* and *yājyā*. The former name, he says, designates those *mantras* which celebrate Agni—namely, the fourth *kāṇḍa*: by the latter are intended the concluding *anuvākas*, or sections, of every *pragṇa*, or chapter, from the beginning of the Sanhitā to the third *pragṇa* of the fourth *kāṇḍa*, inclusive; and, besides, the eleventh *anuvāka* of *pragṇa* six, *kāṇḍa* two (i. e. i.1.14; 2.14; 3.14; 4.46; 5.11; 6.12; 7.13; 8.22: ii.1.11; 2.12; 3.14; 4.14; 5.12; 6.11,12: iii.1.11; 2.11; 3.11; 4.11; 5.11: iv.1.11; 2.11; 3.13—in all, twenty-three *anuvākas*). The name *agni* does not occur again: the *yājyās* are the subject of further prescription below, in rules iii.11, ix.20, xi.3. The compound *agniyājyā* (neuter singular) is justified by a simple reference to Pāṇini's rule (ii.2.29) defining a copulative compound.

The passages cited in illustration of the rule are *adhā hy agne kratoh* (iv.4.47), *adhā ca naḥ garma yacha dvibarhāḥ* (iv.5.10<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), *adhā te sumnam imahe* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>), and *adhā yathā naḥ pitarah* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last word): I have noted no other cases. As counter-example, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is quoted *adhā me 'ti tad vishnave 'ti prāyachat* (ii.4.12<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit *prāyachat*), where *adhā* stands for *adhāḥ*: see, for the bearing of the exception, the note upon the introductory rule of the chapter.

कुत्रादक्षिणेनास्वेनाहृतनाजगामारुहेमाविद्वर्ध्यामाच-  
कृमाक्षामास्तरीमामरेमावर्षयथेरयथारिथापायाथासिञ्चथा-  
जनयथाजयतीक्षतावतायाताशृणुताकृणुताबिभृता ॥ १० ॥

10. Also *kutrā*, *dakshinenā*, *svenā*, *hantanā*, *jagāmā*, *ruhemā*, *vidmā*, *rdhyāmā*, *cakrmā*, *kshāmā*, *starimā*, *bharemā*, *varshayathā*, *irayathā*, *ārithā*, *pāthā*, *athā*, *siñcathā*, *janayathā*, *jayatā*, *ukshatā*, *avatā*, *yātā*, *grñutā*, *krñutā*, *bibhrtā*.

The commentator's illustrative passages are: for *kutrā*, *kutrā cid yasya samr̥tāu* (ii.1.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *dak-*

9. *agnīç-ca yājyā cā 'gniyājyām'*: *tasmin'*: *cā 'rthe dvandva iti' samāsah*. *çgnir ity agnīprakāçakamantrā lakshyante: ca turtihakāṇḍa ity arthah*: *ubhā vām indrāgni* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>) *prabhṛty agnir vṛtrāṇi* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>) *paryantāḥ pragnottamānuvākā yājyāsamjñā bhavanti yukshvā hi* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>) *ity anuvākaç ca*. *'atra vishaye' 'dhe ty asmin' grahane 'ntyasvaro vibhāge' vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: adhā hy----- adhā ca----- adhā te----- adhā y----- agniyājyā iti kim: adhā m-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *jye*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-iñç*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-çaman*. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *etasmīn*. <sup>7</sup> G. *om*.

*shinenā, dakshinenā vasūni patih sindhāndm asi* (iii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit after *vasūni*). For *svenā, svenā hi vrtrañ savasā jaghantha* (vii.4.15: B. omits the last word; G. M. the last two). For *hantand, tapasā hantand tam* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>). For *jagāmā, ā jagāmā parasādh* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>). For *ruhemā, asravanti ā ruhemā svastaye* (i.5.11<sup>5</sup>). For *vidmā, vidmā te agne tredhā trayāni vidmā te* (iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. stop at *agne*, thus instancing only one of the two cases; there are two more in the same verse): also at i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>. For *rdhyāmā, rdhyāmā ta ohāih* (iv.4.4<sup>7</sup>). For *cakrmā, cakrmā kac canā "gah* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>): other cases at i.8.3: ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>: iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>: 6.8<sup>3</sup>. For *kshāmā, kshāmā verihad vīrudhah* (i.3.14<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.12<sup>2,2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases at ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: iv.7.12<sup>3</sup>. For *starimā, sushtarimā jushānā* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>): here the application of rule i.51 becomes necessary. For *bharemā, añhomuce pra bharemd manishām* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *varshayathā, yāyam vrshtim varshayathā purishinah* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *irayathā, ud irayathā marutah* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>). For *ārithā, yoner udārithā yaje tam* (iv.6.5<sup>4</sup>). For *pāthā, kshaye pāthā dīvo vimahasah* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *athā, athā somasya prayati yuvabhyām* (i.1.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): other cases are numerous, namely i.1.13<sup>1</sup> twice; 5.5<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup> twice; 7.13<sup>4</sup>: ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>; 6.12<sup>2</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 4.11<sup>6</sup>: iv.2.1<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>3</sup>, 6<sup>1,2</sup>; 6.3<sup>4</sup> twice; 7.13<sup>5</sup>; and, as I doubt not, at the end of iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>, where, however, the present *samhitā*-text reads *atha*, because the word stands *vibhāge*. For *siñcathā, yatrā naro marutah siñcathā madhu* (iii.1.11<sup>8</sup>). For *junayathā, āpo junayathā ca nah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>). For *jayatā, upa pre 'ta jayatā nara sthirāh* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ukshatā, ā ghrtam ukshatā madhuvarnam* (iv.3.13<sup>8</sup>). For *avatā, asmān u devā avatā haveshu* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>): another case at iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>. For *yātā, devā rathāir yātā hīranyayāih* (iv.7.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *grnutā, marutah grnutā havam* (iv.2.11<sup>2</sup>). For *krnutā, samvatsarāya krnutā brhan namah* (v.7.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *bibhrtā, mātē 'va putram bibhrtā sv enam* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup>: W. B. begin at *putram*).

## भरता याज्यासु ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also *bharatā*, in *yājyā* passages.

10. .... *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>2</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge*  
*yañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: kutrā----*  
*da-ksh-----: svenā-----: tap-----: āj-----: asr-----: vidmā-----:*  
*rdhy-----: cakr-----: kshā-----: susht-----: añh-----: yā-*  
*yam-----: ud-----: yoner-----: kshaye-----: athā-----: ya-*  
*trā-----: āpo-----: upa-----: ā-----: asmān-----: devā-----:*  
*mar-----: sam-----: mā-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *avag*; G. M. om.

Which are the sections called *yājyā* has been pointed out above, under rule 9.

The cited passages are: *bharatā vasuvittamam* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup>), *bharatā jātuvedasam* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *pārvaṇi vaco gnaye bharatā brhāt* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words), which are all that the text contains. As counter-example, to show the necessity of restricting the change to *yājyā* passages, is quoted *esha vo bharatā rājā* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>, 12<sup>2</sup>), where *bharatā* stands for *bharatāh*. If the text contained a *bharatā* as instrumental of the participle *bharant*, it would come more properly under the action of the rule, and would have a better right to be specifically excluded; but I have not found such a form anywhere. Respecting *bharatā* as standing in *samhitā* for *bharatāh*, see what is said in the note to the first rule of this chapter.

अत्ताभवतानदतातरतातपतानुद्धतावीचतामुच्चताच-  
ताघुष्याजनयावर्तयासादयापारयादीयाहुरभरापाससादा-  
सृजातिष्ठयिना ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also *attā*, *bhavatā*, *anadatā*, *taratā*, *tapatā*, *jūhutā*, *vocatā*, *amuñcatā*, *crtā*, *ghushyā*, *janayā*, *vartayā*, *sādayā*, *pārayā*, *diyā*, *harā*, *bharā*, *apā*, *sasādā*, *srjā*, *tishthā*, and *yenā*.

The cited passages are: for *attā*, *attā havīṁshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>). For *bhavatā*, *ādityāso bhavatā mṛdayantah* (i.4.22 and ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>). For *anadatā*, *samprayatir ahāv anadatā hāte* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the first word). For *taratā*, *suvo ruhānās taratā rajāṁsi* (iii.5.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *tapatā*, *gharman na sāmāni tapatā suvrktibhih* (i.6.12<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. [O. begins in the comment to this rule] omit before *tapatā*). For *jūhutā*, *pitre jūhutā viśvakarmāne* (iv.6.2<sup>6</sup>). For *vocatā*, *viśve devāso adhi vocatā me* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit to *adhi*). For *amuñcatā*, *padi shitām amuñcatā yajatrāh* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>). For *crtā*, *ayasmayam vi crtā bandham etum* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>). For *ghushyā*, *parushparur anu ghushyā viśasta* (iv.6.9<sup>3</sup>). For *janayā*, *manur bhava janayā dāivyaṁ janam* (iii.4.2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>7</sup>). For *vartayā*, *tābhīr ā vartayā punah* (iii.3.10<sup>1</sup>). For *sādayā*, *sādayā yujñān sukrtasya yonāu* (iii.5.11<sup>2</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>3</sup>). For *pārayā*, *agne tvam pārayā narayo asmān* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>: all but W. omit the last word). For *diyā*, *brhaspate pari diyā rathena* (iv.6.4<sup>1-2</sup>: the text reads *diya*, as the word stands before the division between the first and second fifty of the section): another case is iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>. For *harā*, *nihāram in ni me harā nihāram*

11. *bharatā ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe<sup>2</sup> 'ntyasvaro yājyāvishaye<sup>3</sup> vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: bhar-----: bhar-----: pār-----: yājyāsv iti kim: esha-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmīn*. <sup>2</sup> B. *avagraheshv*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yājyāyam*, and put before the preceding word.



(i.8.4<sup>1</sup>). For *bharā*, *mā no, mardhīr ā bharā dadhi tan naḥ pra dāpushe* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: O. omits after *bharā*; B. G. M. after *dadhi*): there is no other case, *bhurā* at i.3.14<sup>3</sup> in the Calcutta edition being an erratum. For *apā*, *duro na vājan crutya apā vrdhi* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>: W. B. omit the first two words). For *sasādā*, *agnir hotā nī sha-sādā yajīyan* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word): there is another case at iv.6.2<sup>1</sup>, requiring, like the others, the application of rule i.51. For *srjā*, *srjā vrshtim divah* (ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>): there are other cases at ii.4.8<sup>2</sup>: iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>. For *tishthā*, *tishthā devo na savitā* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>): other cases at iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: v.2.1<sup>4</sup>, and perhaps also at iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>, where the word ends a division of the *anuvāka*. For *yenā*, *yenā sahasram vahasī* (iv.7.13<sup>4</sup> and v.7.7<sup>3</sup>).

## उष्मसीक्रयीकृधीश्रुधीयदी ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also *uṣmasī*, *krayī*, *kṛdhī*, *śrudhī*, and *yadī*.

The quoted examples for these words, being the only ones which the text contains, are as follows. For *uṣmasī*, *te te dhāmāny uṣmasī gamadhye* (i.3.6<sup>1-2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words): here, as *uṣmasī* stands at the end of a division, or *vibhāge*, its *i* is short in the accepted text. For *krayī*, *rudra yat te krayī param nāma* (i.8.14<sup>2</sup>). For *kṛdhī*, *kṛdhī sv asmān adīteḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word). For *śrudhī*, *imam me varuna śrudhī havam* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>). For *yadī*, *yadī bhāmim janayan* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

## सूतूनूमियूमजू ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also *sū*, *tū*, *nū*, *mīthū*, *makshū*, and *ū*.

The cited passages are as follows: for *sū*, *mo shū nā indra* (i.8.3). For *tū*, *ā tū na upa gantana* (i.5.11<sup>4-5</sup>): there are two other cases, i.7.13<sup>3</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>, both after *ā*. For *nū*, *etacasya nū rane* (iv.6.1<sup>2</sup>). For *mīthū*, *gātrāny asinā mīthū kāk* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the first word). For *makshū*, *makshū devavato rathah* (i.8.22<sup>3</sup>). For *ū*, a part of the manuscripts give two examples,

12. ----- *eteshv anavagraheshv<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro<sup>2</sup> vibhāge vyañ-janaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: attā----- ād----- sampr----- suvo----- ghar----- pitre----- viṣve----- padī----- ayas----- par----- man----- tābh----- sād----- agne----- brh----- nih----- nā----- duro----- agnir----- srjā----- tish----- yenā-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. av-; G. M. grahameshu. <sup>2</sup> O. begins here.

13. ----- *ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> anavagraheshv<sup>3</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge vyañjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: te----- rudra----- kṛdhī----- imam----- yadī-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. eshv. <sup>3</sup> W. av-; G. M. om.

*asmābhir ā nu praticakshyā bhūt* (i.4.33: wanting in G. M.), and *ūrdhva ā shu na utaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first word, G. M. the last): other cases are found at i.5.11<sup>5</sup>: ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>: iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>: 6.5<sup>6</sup>: v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: vii.1.18<sup>2</sup>: 6.17<sup>2</sup>.

## व्युत्पूर्व आननुदात्तो ऽनूष्मवत्यनूष्मवति ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *ān*, when unaccented, and preceded by *vi* or *ut*, in a word containing no spirant.

This rule applies simply to the compounds *vyāna* and *udāna*, in which the long *ā* of the radical syllable is treated by the *pada*-text as the effect of an irregular prolongation. The words are instanced by the commentator in their full *pada*-form, *vyānāye 'ti vi-anāya* (iii.5.8 et al.), and *udānāye 'ty ut-anāya* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup> et al.). In the same manner, *prānāya* and *apānāya* are divided into *pra-anāya* and *apa-anāya*. As regards the treatment of this group of compounds, the different *pada*-texts are somewhat inconsistent and somewhat conflicting. The Atharvan *pada* (see Ath. Pr. iv.39) divides *vi-āna* and *sam-āna*, without correption of the radical *ā*, but leaves *prāna* and *apāna* undivided. The Rik *pada* does not divide *prāna*: I do not know that any of the others are Rik words. The White Yajus, again (Vāj. Pr. v.33,36), divides *apa-āna* and *sam-āna*, but not *prāna*. The consistency of the Tāittirīya *śākhināḥ* is to be commended; less, perhaps, their assumption that the *ā* of *āna* is a mere Vedic irregularity, requiring restoration to a correcter form. They also, it may be remarked, divide *prānatha* (iv.1.4<sup>1</sup>) into *pra-anatha*.

The commentator goes on to cite counter-examples, proving the necessity of the restrictions imposed by the rule. To show that *ān* is to be shortened only after *vi* and *ut*, he gives *yad āncus tene 'yam* (vii.3.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word), and *pariānīyā havanīyasya* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>). To show that only *ān*, not *ā* followed by any other consonant, is shortened, he quotes *yad rukmanī vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup>), and *udādāya prthivīm jirādīnuh* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). To show that the *ān* must not be accented, he gives *viśvākarmā vyā'nat* (iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>), and *nēshtah pātnīm udā'naya* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>). Finally, to show that the presence of a spirant in the word prevents the correption, we have *pathā madhor dhārā vyānaṣuḥ* (v.7.7<sup>3</sup>: all but W. omit the first word), and *ud ānishur mahīr itī* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>).

The question is now in point, how complete is this rehearsal of the cases of prolonged vowels occurring in the Sanhitā; or, how closely does the *pada*-text which it assumes correspond with that

14. .... ity<sup>1</sup> eteshv<sup>2</sup> anavagraheshv<sup>3</sup> antyasvaro vibhāge  
vyāñjanaparo hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: mo..... ā.....  
eta.....: gā.....: mak.....: asm.....: ūrdhva.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. eshv. <sup>3</sup> W. av-; G. M. om.

found in the existing *pada*-manuscripts? As regards the latter point, I am unable to speak with certainty, of course, without the possession of a *pada*-manuscript, and its careful examination throughout; but so much as this I can say—that, having referred a liberal selection of the most questionable cases to Dr. Haug at Munich, for verification in his *pada*-texts, no instance of a discordance between these and the *Prātiçākhyā* has come to light. Among the cases referred were several in regard to which I was beforehand very confident that I had caught the authors of the *Prātiçākhyā* in fault. Thus *yojā*, in the refrain *yojā nv indra te hari* (i.8.5<sup>1,2</sup>) which is shortened to *yoja* in the *pada*-texts both of the Rik (by Rik Pr. vii.7) and the White Yajus (by Vāj. Pr. iii.106), remains *yojā* in that of our *Sanhitā*. Again, *eva* occurs six times in our text with its final lengthened (viz. at i.8.22<sup>2</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>3</sup>: iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>: 3.13<sup>3</sup>: 7.15<sup>7</sup>: v.2.8<sup>3</sup>), as it does also not infrequently in the other Vedic texts (as noticed and provided for in their *Prātiçākhyas*: see Rik Pr. vii.12,19; viii.20: Vāj. Pr. iii.123: Ath. Pr. iii.16, note, I.1.c.): but the *Tāittirīya pada* reads in each case *evā*. Once more, in the passage *tava dharmā yuyopima* (Rig-Veda vii.89.5; Ath. Veda vi.51.3; Tāitt. Sanh. iii.4 11<sup>6</sup>), the *pada*-texts of the Rik and Atharvan read *dharmā* (I do not find that the case is noted in the Rik Pr.; in the Ath. Pr. it would fall under the comprehensive rule iii.16), while that of our *Sanhitā* has *dharmā*, like the *samhitā*-reading.

I will add, as received from the same quarter, a few words respecting which a question might naturally arise as to how they were treated in the *pada*-text. Separated, without correction of the long vowel at the end of their first member, are *uttarā-vat* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>), *sahasā-van* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>), *māmalā-bhavant* (i.4.34), *vṛṣhā-kapi* (i.7.13<sup>2</sup>), such copulative compounds as *indrā-varuṇayoh* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>) and *agnā-vishnū* (i.1.12), and *urṇā-mradas* (i.1.11<sup>1</sup>: while, nevertheless, we have *urṇa-mradas* at i.2.2<sup>2</sup>, the *pada*-reading agreeing in both cases with that of the *samhitā*: where the Calcutta edition gets its authority for reading *urṇāmmradas* and *urṇaimradas* is more than I can imagine).

15. *vī 'ty evampārva upārvo vā 'n ity esha ' svāro 'nūdātto 'nāshnavaty' āshmarahite pade vartamāno vyañjanaparāḥ paddāu vartamānatvāt pārvapadena' vibhāge sati hrasvam āpadyate. yathā: vyānāye 'ti vi-anāya: udānāye 'ty ut-anāya. evampārva iti kim: yad-----: pary-----: nakāraḥ kimarthaḥ: yad-----: udā-----: anūdātta iti kim: viçv-----: nesh-----: anāshnavati 'ti kim: pāthā-----: ud-----.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarāṇe  
trītyo 'dhyāyaḥ'.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ākāra*. <sup>2</sup> W. *āshm*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*de*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *çrikrishṇāya namaḥ*.

Not separated, and therefore, of course, without correction of the vowel, are such words as *rtāshāt* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>) and *turāshāt* (i.7.13<sup>4</sup>), also *tvashṭimant* (i.2.5<sup>2</sup>), *anyādr̥ç* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup>), *ubhayādat* (ii.2.6<sup>3</sup>), *arāṭṭiyant* (i.6.1<sup>1</sup>) and *arāṭṭivan* (vii.4.15), *atīkāça* (i.2.2<sup>2</sup>) and *prā-kāça* (i.8.18), *avāçr̥nga* (ii.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *prāçr̥nga* (ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: I doubt not: my information is deficient for this word), *upānaḥ* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *nīvāra* (iv.7.4<sup>2</sup>) and *nīhāra* (iv.6.2<sup>3</sup>), and *purāravah* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

There is not, as in the other Vedic texts, any restoration of a theoretically correct short vowel which is not strictly a final or initial: thus we read in *pada*-text, for example, *vāvṛdhe* (i.4.20), *sāsa-hat* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *ushāsam* (iv.4.4<sup>2</sup>).

Many of these items constitute striking peculiarities of the *Tāittirīya pada*, and its careful study and comparison with the other works of its class would undoubtedly bring to light much that is curious.

## CHAPTER IV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, introductory; 5-54, rehearsal of cases of *pragrahas*, or uncombinable final vowels.

### अथ प्रग्राहः ॥ १ ॥

#### 1. Now the *pragrahas*.

A simple heading to the chapter, and explained as such by the commentator. The same subject is treated by the other *Prātiçākhyas*, at *Rik Pr.* i.18-19, *Vāj. Pr.* i.92-98, *Ath. Pr.* i.73-82. It occupies here a great deal more space, because the *Tāitt. Pr.* avoids on principle the mention of grammatical categories in its rules, and is at infinite pains to catalogue, word by word, what the other treatises dispose of summarily, by classes. A rule in a later chapter (x.24) teaches that all the vowels here rehearsed and defined as *pragraha* are exempt from euphonic combination. The term *pragraha* is peculiar to this treatise, the rest using instead *pragr̥hya*.

### नावग्रहः ॥ २ ॥

#### 2. No former member or a compound is *pragraha*.

As the former member of a separable compound (*avagraha*: i.49) is regarded and treated as an independent *pada*, the rules declaring certain final vowels *pragraha* would apply to the finals

---

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: pragrahā ucyanta ity 'etaḍ' adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita' uttaraṁ yad vakshyāmaḥ.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. om. \* G. M. om.

of such members, but for this prescription to the contrary. The commentator cites rules 5, 6, 36, 37, 49 of the chapter as needing the restriction of their application here made, and quotes from the *Sanhitā* in illustration *tanānapād asuraḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>1</sup>: the *tanā* of *tanānapād* would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 5), *agoargham yajamānam* (vi.1.10<sup>1</sup>: *ago-argham* would fall else under rule 6), *agnīśomāu mā* (ii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: it is implied that the *pada*-text would write *agnī-somāu*, bringing the word within the sphere of rule 36; such compounds are not divisible in the other Vedic texts), and *dvedve puronuvākye kuryāt* (ii.2.9<sup>2</sup>: the *pada* writes *dve-dve*, so that both members would be declared alike *pragraha* by rule 49). The present precept is therefore declared to be one making exceptions in advance to the rules specified.

अन्तः ॥ ३ ॥

### 3. Only a final is *pragraha*.

Or, as the commentator paraphrases, the end of a word is entitled to the designation *pragraha*. He cites, as example, the phrase *devate samrddhyāi* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>). The necessity of the rule, he explains, arises out of the fact that the following rules, in part—for example, rules 5, 6, 33—describe certain letters or syllables as *pragraha* without farther limitation, and it is desirable to specify that they bear that character only when final. This in answer to the criticizing inquiry “whether a letter not final can also be *pragraha*?”—that is, as I understand it, whether this predicate is not in the nature of things restricted to finals? But now a yet more troublesome objection is raised. The limitation to finals, urges the interpellator, is otherwise assured; for the word *api* of the next rule, in the sequel of this one, brings into action the principle “continued implication is of that which is last” (i.58). The objection is wholly futile and inept, both as implying that false interpretation of the rule appealed to to which attention was directed in the note upon it, and as attributing to *api* a mysterious force to which it can lay no claim whatever. Instead, however, of showing the

2. *avagrahaḥ pragraho na bhavati: ākāraḥ* (iv.5): *okāro 'sāñhito 'kāravyañjanaparaḥ* (iv.6): *gnī* (iv.36): *na hi paraḥ* (iv.37): *dve* (iv.49) *iti vakshyate: etad<sup>4</sup> uddīcya puras-tādapavādo 'nena vidhīyate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: tan-----: ago-----: agn-----: dve-----: avagraha<sup>2</sup> iti jātyapekshāyām ekavacanam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -ti; B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. tad. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. nā 'v.

3. *padasyā 'ntaḥ pragrahasamjño bhavati. yathā: dev-----: atrā<sup>2</sup> 'ha: kim apadānto 'pi pragrahaḥ syāt. atro 'cyate: ākāraḥ* (iv.5) *ity aviśeṣheṇa vakshyati: okāro 'sāñhito 'kāravyañjanaparaḥ* (iv.6) *iti: cī yatpraparaḥ* (iv.33) *iti ca: apadāntasyo 'kārasyaū 'kārasya cīcābdasya vā pragrahatvam<sup>1</sup> mā bhūd iti.*

objector to the door; the commentator proceeds elaborately to confute him. "We reply, not so: specification of finality is appropriate where there is a congeries of several letters; here, on the other hand, there is indication of a single letter. If the matter in question were the euphonic alteration or elision of *ā* and the other letters treated of, a final would be designated in virtue of the principle quoted: but here it is a simple case of application of the term *pragraha*, not of an affected nor an affecting letter: hence continued implication has no force."

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥४॥

4. It is followed by *iti*.

This is the interpretation of the commentator, who declares that the "also" (*api*) brings in by implication, from the first rule of the preceding chapter, the specification *vibhāge*, 'in case of separation,' or in the *pada* and other artificially divided texts. As example, he cites *ubhe iti* (i.4.22 et al.: G. M. add *devate iti*, ii.1.9<sup>a</sup> et al.).

If such be its real meaning, the rule is a very anomalous one, as giving a single direct prescription respecting the mode of construction of the secondary texts. These are elsewhere only referred to or implied, in a more indirect manner. I should therefore prefer to translate 'even when followed by *iti*'—that is to say, a word here defined as *pragraha* in the ordinary text has that character also in the other texts before *iti*, not being combined with the latter.

उकारः ॥५॥

5. A long *ū* is *pragraha*.

*nanu siddham evāi 'tat: etatsūtrageshabhūta' uttarasūtre' 'piçabdenā 'nvādeço 'ntyasya (i.58) eva kāryaṇīrvāhāt'. ne 'ti brāmāḥ: anekavarṇasamuḍāye hy antyatvam' upapannam: ayam punar ekavarṇanirdeçah: ākārah (iv.5) ity ādivarṇasya yāni vikāralopāu tayor ' anvādeço 'ntyasya (i.58) ity anenā 'ntyah: pragraha ity uktam' pragrahasamījñāmātram': na tu' nimittam nimitti vā: tasmād anvādeço na prasaratī.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *grahanam*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *-çeshe*; G. M. *-bhūt*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ottarasya sū-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-vāhakah*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *anta-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. *'ntyapratyaya uktah*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *-ha iti sam-*. <sup>9</sup> B. O. om.

4. *apiçabdah sīnhāvalokanena 'thā 'dāv uttare vibhāge (iii.1) ity atra vibhāgapadam' anvādiçati: so 'yam pragraho vibhāga itiparo bhavati. yathā: ' ubhe iti. itīçabdah paro yasmād asāv itiparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-gam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *devate iti*.

The commentator adds the limitation "if long in *pada*-text," the final *ā* is universally *pragraha*; referring, in justification, to the cases treated of above, in rule iii.14, of an *u* irregularly lengthened in *samhitā*. His examples are *hanū vā ete yajñasya* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word), *vāsantikāv rtā sukraḥ ca* (iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *rtā*), and *harinasya bāhū upastutām janima tat te arvan* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last four words; the others, the first word).

## ओकारो ऽसाक्षिता ऽकारव्यञ्जनपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Also an *o* which is not the product of euphonic combination, if followed by *a* or a consonant.

Of words exhibiting in *pada*-text, as well as in *samhitā*, a final *o*, there are (apart from the theme *go*, which occurs only as first member of a compound, and therefore, by rule 2 of this chapter, does not require to be regarded in the determination of *pragrahas*) two classes, the one composed of vocatives from themes in *u*, the other of words whose final *a* or *ā* is combined with the particle *u*. The present rule deals, in general, with the former class; the one next following, with the latter class. The right of the vocatives in *o* to be treated as *pragrahas* is a very dubious one, and is not unequivocally supported by the *Prāticākhyā*; for to say that such words are *pragraha* before *a* or a consonant is not to distinguish them perceptibly from the euphonic *o* which comes from a final *as*; since this also is not capable of combination with a consonant, and does not necessarily absorb a following initial *a*. The only instances in which a vocative in *o* exhibits a *pragraha* character are the three which are cited under the next rule (i.4.27: v.7.2<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>); the cases in which it is regularly changed to *av* before other vowels than *a* are much more numerous: namely, before *ā*, at i.4.39: ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>; before *i*, at ii.2.12<sup>9</sup>; before *u*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 6.12<sup>3</sup>: iii.2.10<sup>1</sup>; before *e*, at ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>. I have noted but two cases in the text where such an *o* stands before initial *a* without absorbing it; they are found at i.3.8<sup>1</sup>, 14<sup>7</sup>. And there are the same

5. *ākūrah padāntah sarvatra pragraho bhavati: padasamaye vartamānah. yathā: hanū----- vās----- har----- padasamaye vartamāna iti kim: sātānāmīthūmakshāū<sup>1</sup> (iii.14) ity ādi.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. omit after *mīthū*.

6. *asāmhitā okāro 'kāraparo vā' vyañjanaparo vā pragrahaḥ syāt. yathā: vad----- vish----- asāmhitā iti kim: so----- 'pra----- evampara iti kim: vish----- samhitānimittah sāmhitah: na sāmhitō 'sāmhitah: akāraḥ ca vyañjanam cā 'kāravyañjane: te pare yasmāt sa tatho 'ktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> W. B. O. om.

number of cases—namely, at ii.5.12<sup>5</sup> and vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>—in which it causes the elision of a following *a*.

The commentator's citations in illustration of the rule are *vad-mā hi sūno asi* (i.3.14<sup>7</sup>), and *viśno havyañ rakshasva* (i.1.3). To show the necessity of the limitation *asāmhitah*, he cites *so 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: omitted, however, by W. B. O.), where *so* is the *sāmhitā* reading for *saḥ*; and, to show that the prescribed quality belongs to the vowel only before *a* or a consonant (the *lacuna* of W. B. O. extends through this explanation), he gives us *viśnav e 'hī 'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>).

For the teachings of the other *Prāṭicākhyas* respecting this class of asserted *pragrahas*, see the note to Ath. Pr. i.81.

## समृद्धयपितृवश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7. As also, when preceded by *s*, *m*, *h*, *d*, *th*, and *pit*.

The *anuvṛtti* of this rule is even more blind and equivocal than usual. Instead of bringing down either the subject or predicate of the one preceding, we are to bring down both, only with the exclusion of one of the modifications included in the former. The meaning is, that an original *o*, preceded as here specified, is *pragraha* even when followed by other vowels than *a*. The commentator is in error in saying that *ca* implies *okārah* from above; he should have said *okaro 'sāmhitah*.

As above remarked, this rule chiefly concerns the class of *pragrahas* composed of words whose final vowel, *a* or *ā*, is combined with the particle *u*. Of these, *atho* is vastly the most numerous, occurring about two hundred and fifty times in the *Sanhita*. Before *a* it is met with twenty times, always without occasioning elision; before other vowels, twenty-nine times, always uncombined. Along with it, *tatho* is had in view by the rule, as presenting a final *o* after *th*: it is found but once, in the passage cited by the commentator (see below). The only word showing *o* after *s* is *so*, found only in two passages, as noted below. After *m*, we have *o* both in *mo* (in two passages, once before *sh*, at i.8.3; the other is cited by the commentator) and in *imo*, which latter is found only before *a* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), and so does not necessarily come within the purview of the rule. The other words of the class occur before consonants alone, and are, therefore, here made no account of: they are *o* (once, i.4.33), to

7. *pūrvoktaparanimittābhāve 'pi kāryavidhānārtham okāram viṣinashtī: cakāra okāram anvādicati. sa: ma: ha: da: tha: pit: evampūrvō 'sāmhitā okāro 'kāryavyañjanābhyām anyaparo 'pi pragraho bhavati. yathā: so----- mā----- upa----- indo----- tatho----- sa----- evampūrvā iti kim: 'ṣat----- asāmhitā iti kim': pra-----*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om.



(i.2.5<sup>2</sup> and vi.1.8<sup>5</sup>) and *uto* (five times), *upo* (four times), and *pro* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>).

Of the remaining specifications of the rule, the *h* is made for but a single case of the exclamation *ho*, which the commentator quotes: *upahātāñs ho ity āha* (ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>); the *d* is for the vocative *indo*, which occurs twice: *indo indriydvatuḥ* (i.4.27), and *indo ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>3</sup>): the commentator quotes the latter passage; the *pī* is for the vocative *pīto*, only found once, as cited: *sa no mayobhāḥ pīto ā viśasva* (v.7.2<sup>4-5</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words). These three, as was noted under the preceding rule, are the only instances which the Sanhitā affords of vocatives in *o* showing an uncombinable quality.

The commentator's explanation of the rule is "the *o* is here specially distinguished in order to the prescription of its quality even in the case of absence of the sequent determining circumstances before stated." As examples of words whose ending is combined with *u*, after the consonants specified, he gives *so evāi 'shāi 'tasya* (ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>; 5.5<sup>5</sup>), *mā bher māro mo eshām* (iv.5.10<sup>1</sup>), and *tatho evo 'ttare nir vapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>: W. B. O. omit after *uttare*). His counter-examples are *gatakrutav' ud vañcam iva* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *iva*), and *pra so agne* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>): but G. M., which have given the latter passage under the preceding rule, here substitute for it *mā so asmāñ avahāya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>); their separate application is manifest.

The treatment by the Prātiśākhya of words ending in *o* is awkward and bungling to a degree quite rare or wholly unknown elsewhere in its rules. We should be justified in inferring from its statements that *o*, *to*, *uto*, *upo*, and *pro* were not regarded as *pragrahas* at all, nor the vocatives in *o* except under the conditions and in the places specified, and that (if the commentator's explanation of rule 4 is accepted) they are not written with *iti* in the *pada*-text: while, doubtless, in every *pada*-text of the Black Yajus, as in those of the other Vedas, each word is treated uniformly, whether it happen to exhibit its uncombinable quality in *saṃhitā* or not. Through the rest of the chapter, it will be noticed, the words mentioned are defined as *pragrahas*, without regard to the circumstances in which they may stand in the text.

## अथैकारेकारौ ॥ ८ ॥

### 8. Now follow cases of *e* and *i*,

This is a heading for the remainder of the chapter, excluding all other vowels than final *e* and *i* from the action of its rules. The words exhibiting such finals are, of course, mainly duals, and are by the other treatises simply defined as such, with immense saving of trouble.

8. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ekārekārāñs' pragrahatvena vidhīyete' ity etad' adhikṛtañ vedittvyam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ekāra ikārah*. <sup>2</sup> W. O. *-yate*; B. *-yayate*; G. M. *viśishyata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

अस्मे ॥ १ ॥

9. *Asme* is *pragraha*.

The example cited by the commentator is, according to W. B. O., *asme te bandhuh* (i.2.7); according to G. M., *sampatte gor asme candrânî* (also i.2.7). Neither exhibits in *samhitâ* the *pragraha* quality of the word, as is done at i.7.13<sup>5</sup> and elsewhere: *asme* is not uncommon in the *Sanhitâ*, occurring twenty-nine times.

वे इत्यनिंग्यान्तः ॥ १० ॥

10. Also *tve*, when not the final member of a separable compound.

The office of the word *iti* in this rule is differently explained by the two versions of the commentary: W. B. O. say that it indicates the quality of a separable cited word (they mean, doubtless, of an inseparable); G. M., that it indicates *pragraha* quality. Each interpretation is as good, and as worthless, as the other. The commentary is not infrequently at much pains to put some special, even wonderful, significance into *iti* when found in a rule; and generally with as little acceptable result as here.

The pronoun *tve* occurs seven times in the *Sanhitâ* (at i.3.14<sup>2</sup>; 4.46<sup>1</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>7</sup>; 5.10<sup>1</sup>; iv.2.7<sup>3</sup>; 6.5<sup>4</sup>; vi.1.8<sup>5</sup>), exhibiting its *pragraha*-quality in *samhitâ* only once (at iv.2.7<sup>3</sup>). The commentator's instance is *tve kratum api* (iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>; G. M. omit *api*); and his counter-instance, to show the necessity of the restriction imposed in the rule, is *anâgâstve adititve turâsah* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>; G. M. omit *turâsah*), where the *pada*-text reads *anâgâh-tve : aditi-tve*.

देवतेउभेभागधेउर्ध्वेविशाखेशृङ्गेऽन्नेमेधेतृप्तेतृद्येकनी-  
निकेयार्थेशिवेचोत्तमेऽवोत्तरेशिप्रेर्यन्तरेवत्सरस्यद्वपेवि-  
द्वपेविषुद्वपेसदोहविर्धानेअधिषवणोअहोरात्रेधृतव्रतेस्तुत-

9. *asme ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahane 'ntyasvarah pragraho bhavati.*  
*yathâ: asme-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etamin*.

10. *itiçabda ingyagrahanatvam<sup>1</sup> dyotayati: aningyântas tve*  
*ity esha çabдах pragraho bhavati. yathâ: tve----- aningyânta.*  
*iti kim: anâ----- ingyasyâ 'nta ingyântah: ne 'ngyânto*  
*'ningyântah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pragrahatvam*. T. W. B. O. write *ingy-* throughout.



two other passages (iv.6.24: vi.2.9<sup>1</sup> again; 3.9<sup>6</sup>). For *trpne*, *asam-trpne hi hanū atho khalu* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words). For *trdyē*, *saṁtrdyē dhṛtyādi* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>). For *kanīnike*, *yad atirātrānu kanīnike agnīṣṭomānu yat* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. begin at *kan-*): the same word occurs twice more in the next division. For *pārṣve*, *pārṣve paraḥsamānah* (vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>): it is found a second time in the same division. For *give*, *pitarah somyāsah give no dyāvapṛthivī* (iv.6.8<sup>4</sup>: W. B. O. begin at *give*). For *co 'ttame*, *vikarṇīm co 'ttame upa dadhāti* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words): and, to show the necessity of the *ca*, *saṁvatsaraṇ saṁpādyo 'ttame māsi* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>). For *evo 'ttare*, *tatho evo 'ttare nirvapet* (iii.4.9<sup>7</sup>): and, to show why *eva* had to be included in the rule, *nāi 'ti śhodagṃ uttare tena* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *tena*). For *ṣipre*, *pūtvā ṣipre avepayah* (i.4.30: W. B. O. begin with *ṣipre*). For *rathamtare*, *yad brhadrathamtare anvarjeyuh* (vii.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *yad*): the same compound occurs in several places elsewhere. For *vatsarasya rūpe*, *saṁvatsarasya rūpe āpnvanti* (vii.5.1<sup>4</sup>). For *virūpe*, *samanasā virūpe dhāpayete* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup>; 6.5<sup>2</sup>; 7.12<sup>3</sup>). For *vishurūpe*, *vishurūpe ahanā dyāur ivā 'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. stop with *ahanā*). The necessity of including in the rule, besides the *pada rūpe*, the words *vatsarasya*, *vishu* (of *vishu-rūpe*), and *vi* (of *vi-rūpe*) is proved by the citation of *arākṣhitam dṛṣṭa ā rūpe annam* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup>), where *rūpe* is locative: and the commentary adds the remark (wanting, however, in the South-Indian MSS.), "the separate specification of the word *rūpa* is to be looked upon as for the sake of distinct enunciation." For *sadohavirdhāne*, *sadohavirdhāne eva sam minoti* (ii.5.5<sup>6</sup>): the compound occurs twice more, at vi.2.6<sup>2</sup>; 5.1<sup>5</sup>. To justify the 'inclusion of *sadah*, the commentator quotes *uparavā havirdhāne khāyante* (vi.2.11<sup>1</sup>); but the case appears to him one not to be so easily disposed of, and he enters into an elaborate discussion of it, which I defer to the end of this note, in order not to interrupt the connection. For *adhishavane*, *hanū adhishavane jīhvā* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>): it is also found in the preceding division of the same section, and at iv.7.8<sup>1</sup>. The *adhi* is justified by reference to *stīvanesavane 'bhi grhṇāti* (vi.4.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>3</sup>). For *ahorātre*, *ahorātre prā 'viṣaṇ* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>): the word occurs not infrequently elsewhere. The passage *atirātre paṇḍakāmya* (vi.6.11<sup>4</sup>) is given to account for the inclusion of *ahah*; this implies, of course, that the Tāittirīya *pada*-text treats the word as a separable compound, *ahah-rātre*. For *dhṛtavrate*, *dyāvapṛthivī dhṛtavrate āvinā devī* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last

*prativigeshanam uccāranavīspashtārthan<sup>8</sup> drashtavyam<sup>9</sup>: sad-  
----: sada iti kim: up----- nanu padagrahaṇeśhu pa-  
daṁ gamyeta* (i.50) *iti sāmāthyād 'dhavirdhāne ity ekapada-  
syādi 'va kāryasiddhiḥ: sadahpadaṁ vyartham. māi 'vam: pa-  
dagrahaṇe sthālāntare<sup>10</sup> bhinnarūpasya<sup>11</sup> sambhāvānyām<sup>12</sup> vi-  
geshanam sārthakam bhavati<sup>13</sup>: bhinnarūpatvābhāve tu codyam  
etad bhavet<sup>14</sup> nanu tarhi devate iti padagrahaṇasya sthālāntare<sup>15</sup>*

word); and, to account for the inclusion of *dhṛta*, *yasya vrata pushtipatih* (iii.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *stutaḥ*, *stutaḥ evāi'tena duhe* (v.6.8<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit the last word): it occurs again at vii.3.13. This time, resort is had to "another text" (*gākhāntaram*) for a passage to explain why the rule does not say simply *castre*: it is *ūrdhve castre pratishthite*. For *ṛksāme*, *ṛksāme vāi devebhyah* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>): the word is found twice in this division, and also at vi.5.9<sup>2</sup>; 6.7<sup>4</sup>. Here, again, a passage in "another text," *brahma sāme pratishthite* (G. M. omit the last word, and B. O. omit the *sā* of *sāme*), is appealed to in justification of the *ṛk*. For *akte*, *purāravā ghrtenā'kte vrshanam dadhāthām* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup> and [except *purāravāh*] vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first word, B. also the last). For *arpite*, *dyāvaprthivī bhuvaneshu arpite* (iv.7.13<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). For *rāivate*, *gākvarardivate sāmāni* (i.8.13<sup>2</sup> and iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>): the same compound is found again at iv.3.2<sup>5</sup>. For *pūrte*, the different recensions give different examples: W. B. O. have *iṣṭāpūrte sañ srjethām* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>); G. M., *iṣṭāpūrte kṛnutāt* (v.7.7<sup>2</sup>): I have noted no other cases: for the treatment of the word in the *pada*-text see the note to iii. 6. For *pratte*, *pratte kāmam annādyam duhāte* (v.4.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *vidhṛte*, again, W. B. O. have *vidhṛte sarvataḥ* (vi.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and G. M. *tasmān nāsikayā cakshuṣi vidhṛte samāni* (ii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), and the *vi* is justified by an alleged citation from "another text," *agnidhṛte* (G. M., however, omitting the *agni*, thus leaving it to be understood that the simple word *dhṛte* is found elsewhere not *pragraha*). For *anṛte*, *satyanṛte avapacyan* (v.6.1<sup>1</sup>). For *achidre*, *achidre bahule ubhe* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *ubhe*), which answers also for *bahule*: it is the only passage containing either word. For *pūrvaje*, *pūrvaje pitarā navyasibhiḥ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: W. B. O. omit the last word): another passage beginning with the same word is the subject of rule 23 of this chapter. Once more a word, *prathamaje*, is cited from "another text," in order to explain why the rule does not say simply *je* (since the *pada*-text writes *pūrvaje*). For *kṛnudhvañ sadane*, finally, we have the sole passage in which it occurs, *gīrbhiḥ kṛnudhvañ sadane ṛtusya* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *ṛtusya*), with the counter-example *apām tvā sadane sādyaṃmi* (iv.3.1: G. M. omit the last word), to show the necessity of *kṛnudhvañ*.

To return, now, to the long word *sadohavirdhāne*. The objection is raised, that its part *sadaḥ* is unnecessary, and that it would

*soma.... iti bhinnarāpatvād<sup>15</sup> viśeṣaṇena bhavitavyam: tac ca nā'sti. ucyate: devate ity akhandāpadasyai'va kāryavidhānād atra viśeṣaṇam na yujyate: akhandavidhānam<sup>16</sup> iti katham pratiyate: te ity asya te mā patam (iv.42) ity ādinā prthakkarandā iti brāmaḥ: nāi<sup>17</sup> 'vām havirdhāne<sup>18</sup> ity asyā<sup>19</sup> 'khandatvadyotakanā<sup>20</sup> kimcid apy<sup>21</sup> aṣṭi yena sadaḥpadavāiyyarthyaṃ dlabate<sup>22</sup>. hanā....: adhē'ti kim: sav....: aho....: ahar iti kim: ati....: dyāv....: dhṛte 'ti kim: yasya....: stu-*

have been sufficient to say *havirdhāne* simply; for rule 1.50 teaches us that, in citations of *padas*, the cited *pada* alone is to be understood, not any collocation of words or letters phonetically equivalent with it: and *havirdhāne* is here a single *pada* (the compound being divided *sadaḥ-havirdhāne*, while its latter member, occurring by itself as a non-*pragraha*, is written *haviḥ-dhāne*, and so is a congeries of two *padas*). It is replied: not so; a distinctive addition is properly made to a cited *pada*, in case of its occurrence in a different form in another passage; though the objection would hold good, were it not for such occurrence in a different form. But this explanation is not suffered to pass without challenge. In that case, retorts the objector, a distinction ought to be added to *devate*, because it occurs elsewhere in a different form (made up of two independent words), as in *soma deva te matividāḥ* (iii.2.5<sup>2,3</sup>); and no such addition is made. The answer is, that no distinction need here be applied to *devate*, because its treatment is defined as of an undivided word: and, if you ask how its indivisibility is established, we reply that rule 42, below, treats of *te* as a separate *pada* in the various situations in which it is *pragraha* [whence the inference is clear that it is here an inseparable part of the word *devate*]; while there is nothing whatever to show in like manner the indivisibility of *havirdhāne*, and so to prove the addition of *sadaḥ* superfluous. The implication is, that if the *pada dhāne* happened to be described elsewhere as *pragraha* after certain other *padas*, of which *haviḥ* was not one, then we could be sure that *havirdhāne* here meant a single undivided *pada*, and its mention by itself would be enough; while, as things are, one cannot be certain that its part *haviḥ* is not, like the *vi* and *vishu* of *virūpe* and *vishurūpe*, a distinctive addition.

अमीचक्षुषीकाष्णीदेवताफलुनीमुष्टीधीनामीवपाश्र-  
पणीअहनीज्ञन्मनीसुम्निनीसामनीवैष्णावीरेक्षवीदर्वी-  
द्यावापृथिवी ॥ १२ ॥

-----: stute 'ti kim: ūrdh----- iti śākhāntare: rks-----: rg iti  
kim: brah----- iti śākhāntare: pur-----: dyāv-----: śākv-  
-----: iṣṭ-----: prat-----: vidh-----: vī 'ti kim: agn- iti śā-  
khāntare: <sup>23</sup>saty-----: ach-----: pūrv-----: pūrve 'ti kim:  
prath- iti śākhāntare:<sup>23</sup> gīr-----: kṛnūdhvam iti kim: apām

-----  
<sup>1</sup> O. *pragṛhyas*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *bhavantī*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *bhāgadhe*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *viśākhe*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-raṁ*. <sup>6</sup> W. O. *vatsaraviv*. <sup>(7)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> B. *-naṁ vi*; W. O. *-tha*. <sup>(9)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> MSS. *sthāl*. <sup>11</sup> W. *-patvaṁ*. <sup>12</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>13</sup> G. M. om. <sup>14</sup> B. *sthāl*. <sup>15</sup> W. B. O. *abh*. <sup>16</sup> B. O. *-ndīlavi*. <sup>17</sup> W. B. O. *māi*. <sup>18</sup> W. B. O. *sadoh*. <sup>19</sup> W. *asā*; B. *ā*; O. om. <sup>20</sup> W. B. O. ins. *na*. <sup>21</sup> W. B. O. *tathā*. <sup>22</sup> B. *-nibhyate*; G. M. *āpadyate*. <sup>(23)</sup> B. om.

12. Also *amī*, *cakshushī*, *kārshnī*, *devatā phalgunī*, *mushṭī*, *dhī*, *nābhī*, *vapāgrapanī*, *ahanī*, *janmanī*, *sumnīnī*, *sāmanī*, *vāishnavī*, *āikshavī*, *darvī*, *dyāvāprthivī*.

The illustrative passages cited under this rule are as follows. For *amī*, according to W. B. O., *amī vā idam abhātvan* (iii.3.7<sup>1</sup>); but according to G. M., *amī tvā jahati* (iii.2.11<sup>2</sup>): I have noted elsewhere only vi.1.5<sup>4</sup>. For *cakshushī*, *cakshushī vā ete yajñasya* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *yajñasya*): the word occurs about a dozen times. For *kārshnī*, *kārshnī upānahāv. upa muñcate* (v.4.4<sup>4</sup>; 6.6<sup>1</sup>; G. M. omit the last two words). For *phalgunī*, *pitaro devatā phalgunī nakshatram* (iv.4.10<sup>1</sup>): again in the next division of the same section. To show the necessity of including *devatā* in the rule, is given *yad dvitīyaṁ sā phalgunī* (ii.1.2<sup>2</sup>). For *mushṭī*, *mushṭī karoti vācam* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *vācam*). For *dhī*, *pradhī tāv ukthya madhye* (vii.4.11<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *madhye*). For *nābhī*, *rajatīnābhī vāisvadevāu* (v.5.24). For *vapāgrapanī*, *vapāgrapanī pra harati* (vi.3.9<sup>6</sup>): it occurs also in the fourth division of the same section. As counter-example, to explain the presence of *vapā* in the rule, is given, "from another text," the compound *paśugrapanī* (or, as G. M. read, *bhasma-grapanī*): our Sanhitā has *paśugrapanam* at iii.1.3<sup>2</sup>. For *ahanī*, *ahanī dyāvur ivā 'si* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>). For *janmanī*, *ubhe nī pāsi janmanī* (i.4.22). For *sumnīnī*, *sumndya sumnīnī* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>). For *sāmanī*, *sāmanī pratishṭhityādi* (iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>): also at i.8.13<sup>2</sup>. For *vāishnavī*, *valagahundū vāishnavī brhann 'asi* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words). For *āikshavī*, *āikshavī tiracāi* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup> twice). For *darvī*, *darvī grīnīsha āsani* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>). For *dyāvāprthivī*, *dyāvāprthivī eva svena* (ii.1.4<sup>7</sup>): the word is frequently found elsewhere. The commentator gives us here also a counter-example, *mahī dyāvuh prthivī ca nahī* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit *ca nahī*), as if the inclusion of *dyāvā* required justification: but, in ordinary Vedic usage (I have omitted to inform myself in season respecting that of the Tāittirīya *pada*-text), *dyāvā-prthivī* is inseparable, and therefore itself a single *pada*.

पूर्वश्च ॥ १३ ॥

13. As also, the preceding word.

That is to say (by the application of rule i.58), the word preceding the last one mentioned in the rule next above, or *dyāvāprthivī*.

12. ....<sup>1</sup> *etāni padāni pragrahasamjñāni syuḥ*<sup>2</sup>. *yathā*<sup>3</sup>:  
*amī*.....: *caksh*.....: *kārsh*.....: *pit*.....: *devate* 'ti *kim*:  
*yad*.....: *mush*.....: *pra*.....: *raj*.....: *vap*.....: *vape* 'ti  
*kim*: *paś*..... *iti śakṣāntare*: *ah*.....: *ubhe*.....: *sum*.....:  
*sām*.....: *val*.....: *āiksh*.....: *dar*.....: *dyāv*.....: *dyāve*  
*'ti kim*: *mahī*.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *bhavanti*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. om.

vī. The examples given are *yāvati dyāvāprthivī mahitvā* (iii.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *āvinne dyāvāprthivī* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. invert the order of the two citations): I have noted only two other cases of the application of the rule, at ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>; 6.7<sup>5</sup>.

न रुन्धे नित्यम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. But not *rundhe*, in any case.

The case intended to be excluded is quoted by the commentator: *paśūn evā 'va rundhe dyāvāprthivī gacha svāhā* (vi.4.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. omit the first three words and the last). The specification *nityam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' is intended to exclude also the operation of any other rule under which *rundhe* might chance to fall: for example, in *rundhe yadā sahasram* (ii.1.5<sup>2</sup>), where, as preceding *yadā*, it would otherwise be *pragraha* by rule 38 of this chapter. I have noted no other case.

हरीसहुरीसहृतीकल्पयन्तीऽपृशतीऽहृती ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *hari*, *sahuri*, *sahṛti*, *kalpayanti*, *ā pṛshati*, and *āhṛti* are *pragraha*.

The cited examples are as follows. For *hari*, *hari te yuñjā pṛshatī abhātām* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>: <sup>1</sup> M. omit the last two words): it occurs in toward a dozen other passages. For *sahuri*, *sahuri saparyāt* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>); and the counter-example, to show the necessity of the *sa*, *tam āhuri hvayante* (but O. reads *tām*, B. *hvayate*, and G. M. *āhuri vācayati*), claimed to be found "in another text." This would imply, of course, that the *pada*-text reads *sa-huri*—as is in fact the case. For *sahṛti*, *sahṛti vanatām girāḥ* (ii.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as counter-example, for the same purpose as the last, *hṛti punar juhōti* (but G. M. read *manur for punar*), also from "another text." For *kalpayanti*, *adhvarām kalpayanti ūrdhvam yajñam* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, and W. B. O. the last): another case is found at vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>. For *ā pṛshati*, the passage already quoted for *hari*, *yuñjā pṛshatī abhātām* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>); and, to justify the *ā*, the counter-example *pṛshatī sthūlapṛshatī* (v.6.12). For *āhṛti*, *purodācam ete āhṛti juhōti* (i.5.2<sup>3-4</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words, W. B. O. the last): nearly the same phrase occurs again at

13. *cakārenā 'nvādishtadyāvāprthivī ity asmāt pūrvo 'pī 'kāra ekāro<sup>2</sup> vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: yāv-----āv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *etasmāt*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. put before *ikārah*.

14. *rundhe ity antyasvaro<sup>1</sup> dyāvāprthivī ity etasmāt pūrvo 'pī na pragraho bhavati: paśūn----- nityaśabdaḥ prāptyantara-nishedhārthaḥ: rundhe-----: vīdādī<sup>2</sup> (iv.38) prāptiḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *antasv-*; B. O. *antaḥ sv-*. <sup>2</sup> O. *vidādrāv iti*.



i.5.4<sup>4</sup>. To account for the *ā* in this word, G. M. simply cite *huti* as found in "another text:" but W. B. O. give the phrase *huti tasmād evāḥ* (but W. O. read *hūti*, and B. *ddhati*: W. also has *vivā iti* instead of *evā iti*).

पूर्वश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. As also, the preceding word.

Namely *ete*, occurring before *dhuti* in the passage already quoted: *puroḍaṣam ete dhuti* (i.5.2<sup>3</sup>: W. B. O. here omit the first word).

वाससीतपसीरोदसी ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also *vāsasī*, *tapasī*, and *rodasī*.

The examples are: *vāsasī iva vivasānānu* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: the word is also found at i.8.18); *sākshādeva dīkshātāpasī avā rundhe* (vi.1.1<sup>2</sup>: the compound occurs again in the same division: only G. M. have the first two words); and *ime vāi rodasī tayoh* (v.1.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *vāi*): the word is not rarely met with elsewhere.

परश्च ॥ १८ ॥

18. As also, the following word.

The passage contemplated by the rule is, as cited in the comment, *anv indrañ rodasī vāvaṣāne* (i.7.13<sup>1</sup>): there is, I believe, no other falling under it.

15. ----- <sup>1</sup> *eteshv antyasvarah<sup>2</sup> pragrahaḥ syāt<sup>3</sup>: harī*-----  
*sah*-----: *se 'ti kim: tam*----- *iti gākhāntare: sah*-----: *se 'ti*  
*kim: hūti*----- *iti gākhāntare: adhva*-----: *yuñjā*-----: *'e 'ti*  
*kim: prsh*-----: *puro*-----: *e 'ti kim: huti*----- *iti gākhāntare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity.* <sup>2</sup> B. O. *antyaḥ sv.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *bhavati.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ākāreṇa.*

16. *cakārānvādeṣād<sup>1</sup> dhuti ity etasmāt pūrva 'ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: pur*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-anvādishta.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

17. <sup>1</sup>----- *ity etāni pragrahasamjñāni bhavanti. yathā:*  
*vās*-----: *sāk*-----: *ime*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshv antyasvarah<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati.*

18. *cakārānvādishtarodusi<sup>1</sup> ity etasmāt para 'ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: anv*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-tād ro.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

## व्यचस्वतीभरिष्यन्तीनःपृथिवी ॥ ११ ॥

19. Also *vyacasvatī*, *bharishyanti*, and *naḥ prthivī*.

The examples are: *vyacasvatī saṁ vasatkām* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>); *agnim antar bharishyanti jyotishmantam* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup>: G. alone has the last word); and *dyāvā naḥ prthivī imañ sidhram* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>). The needed counter-example for the last is supplied by *rejate agne prthivī makhebhyaḥ* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>).

## येअप्रथेतामुर्वीतिअस्ययंक्रन्दसीहृन्दस्वतीतिआचरन्तीअ- न्तरैताम् ॥ २० ॥

20. Also in the verses beginning *ye aprathetām*, *urvī*, *te asya*, *yam krandasī*, *chandasvatī*, *te ācaranti*, and *antarā*.

The commentator cites only the beginning of each verse, as a word with *pragraha* final occurs at or near the beginning in every case. Thus: *ye aprathetām amitebhiḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: there are three other cases of *pragrahas* in the verse): with the counter-example *ye te panthānaḥ* (vii.5.24), to show that *ye* alone would not have defined the verse; *urvī rodasī varivah* (iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit the last word: three cases, besides *rodasī*, already disposed of by rule 17); *te asya yoshane* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: one more case: the *te* is therefore made no account of in rule 42, below): with the counter-example *te 'vardhanta svatavaso mahitvanā* (iv.1.11<sup>3</sup>), to show the necessity of *asya*; *yam krandasī avasā* (iv.1.8<sup>5</sup>: contains two other cases): and, as counter-example, for a like purpose, *yam agne pṛsu martyam* (i.3.13<sup>2</sup>); *chandasvatī ushasā* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>: it contains seven cases); *te ācaranti* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>: also seven cases): with *te no arvanto havanagrataḥ* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>) as counter-example, to prove that *te* alone would not be enough; and, finally, *antarā mitrāvaruṇā caranti* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>: with four cases).

## नोपस्थे ॥ २१ ॥

21. But not *upasthe*.

19. ----- 'eteshu<sup>1</sup> antyasvarah<sup>2</sup> padāntah<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: vyac----- agn----- dyāvā-----: na iti kim: rej-----

<sup>1</sup> G. eshu. <sup>2</sup> B. -tyah sv-. <sup>3</sup> G. om. (<sup>4</sup>) M. om.

20. ----- etāsv ṛkshv ikāra ekāro<sup>1</sup> vā padāntah pragraho bhavati. yathā: ye----- aprathetām iti kim: ye te----- urvī-----: te----- asye 'ti kim: te 'v-----: yam-----: krandasī iti kim: yam-----: chand-----: te ā-----: ācaranti iti kim: te no----- ant-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ikāro*.

That is to say, *upasthe* is exempted from the action of the preceding rule: it occurs but once in the verses forming the subject of that rule, namely in *mâte 'va putram bibhrtām upasthe* (in the verse beginning *te ācarantī*, iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>: W. B. O. give only the last two words). To show that *sthe* would not have sufficiently defined the -exception (*upa-sthe*), the commentator quotes *ye pratisthe* (*prati-sthe*) *abhavatām* (from the verse beginning with *urvī*, iv.7.15<sup>6</sup>).

## इरावतीप्रभृत्या दाधार ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in the passage beginning with *irāvati*, and ending with *dādāhāra*.

The passage in question is found at i.2.13<sup>2</sup>, and contains six *pragrahas*, whereof one, *rodaṣi*, needs no further provision than was made in rule 17, above; it also contains a word in *e*, *manave*, which is not *pragraha*, being excepted by rule 54. The commentator quotes its beginning, *irāvati dhenumatī hi bhūtam*.

## पूर्वजेप्रभृत्यायम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. And in the passage beginning with *pūrvaje* and ending with *ayam*.

Of this passage, found at ii.6.7<sup>5</sup>, the commentator quotes the first four words. In order to the better understanding of the following discussion, I set it down here in full, along with the word that precedes it: *hwayate pūrvaje rtāvarī ity āha pūrvaje hy ete rtāvarī devī devaputre ity āha devī hy ete devaputre upahāto 'yam*. It contains ten *pragraha* endings, of which, however, two (*pūrvaje*) fall under rule 11, above. The word *ā*, 'as far as,' in the rule, is declared here to exclude the two limiting words mentioned (com-

21. *etāsv ṛkshā 'pasthe ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> padāntaḥ<sup>2</sup> pragraho na bhavati. yathā: m āt----- upe 'ti kim: ye-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *antaḥ sv.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om.*

22. *irāvatiḥprabhṛtī 'rāvati itī<sup>1</sup> śabdām ārabhyā<sup>2</sup> dādāhāra dādāhāraśabdaparyantam<sup>2</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: ir ā-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *om.* <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *paryantam.*

23. *pūrvajepṛabhṛtyayamparyantam<sup>1</sup> ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: pūrv----- āśpadam<sup>2</sup> mār्याdāyānī vartate. nanu pūrv----- ity ārabhyā<sup>2</sup> 'yam----- ity etatparyantam sthalaṃ<sup>1</sup> etatsūtravishayaḥ<sup>2</sup> kinī na syāt. ucyate: bhavātpakṣa upabandhāntaḥpātītva<sup>2</sup> kṛṇudhvañ sadāne (iv.11) itī grahaṇasya<sup>1</sup> vāḍiyarthyañ<sup>1</sup> 'syāt: tan<sup>2</sup> mā bhād itī: tasmād*

pare Pāṇini ii.1.13)—an arbitrary restriction, directly opposed by the analogy of the preceding rule; intended, doubtless, to relieve the treatise of the reproach of declaring the word *pūrvaje* a *pragraha* by two separate rules; but this is a small gain, since the same word occurs a second time in the passage, and cannot there be reached by any such device.

A protracted, not to say tedious, discussion now arises, respecting the sufficiency and propriety of the rule as stated. The first objection is: how do we know that the passage had in view by the rule is not that which begins with *pūrvaje pīturā* (iv.1.11\*) and ends with *ayam purobhuvah* (iv.3.2<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhuvah*). Because, it is answered, the special citation (in rule 11) of *kr̥ṇudhvāṇ sadane* (iv.1.11<sup>4</sup>), which occurs within the limits mentioned, would in that case be rendered superfluous. Objection second: the word *pūrvaje*, at any rate, is useless, it having been already made *pragraha* by rule 11; the rule should read “beginning with *varī*” (the concluding *pada* of the separable compound *rtā-varī*). This, too, is repelled: the rule reads as it stands because *varī* occurs twice in the passage, and the question would arise where the defined limit should be understood to be: moreover, as we are taught (i.25) in case of doubt to take the nearest, we should have to assume as intended the latter of the two, as being nearer to the other specified limit: in which case we should arrive at the untoward result that the *pragraha* character of the first *varī* would not be established at all. But now the objector triumphantly retorts, that there are also two instances of *pūrvaje*, and a like doubt as in the supposition last made would arise as to the identity of the one cited, and a like untoward result as was pointed out in connection therewith. Not so, is the defense: *pūrvaje* is not desig-

*etat\* sthālam etatsūtravishayo na bhavati. nanu atra pūrvajegrahāṇam anarthakam: pūrvajekr̥ṇudhvōṣsadane (iv.11) iti tatratī 'vo 'ktatvāt: '0kiṁ tu'10 varīprabhṛty<sup>11</sup> etāratāi 'vā 'lam. ne 'ti brūmah: varīgrahāṇadvayasambhavāt: kutra vā 'vadhiniyamatenā<sup>12</sup> svikāra<sup>13</sup> iti saṁdehaḥ syāt: kiṁ ca: āsannaṁ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacanād uttorōvadhisaṁnikṛtō<sup>14</sup> dvitīyavarīṣabda eva svikartavyaḥ: tathā soti pūrvavarīṣabdasya<sup>15</sup> pragrahātvaṁ na syūt: tae cā 'nishtam. nanu bhuvanmate 'pi pūrvajedvayasambharāt kutra vā grahāṇam iti saṁdehaḥ samānaḥ: kiṁ ca: yuktyuktam<sup>16</sup> anishtam ca<sup>17</sup> samānam<sup>18</sup>. mātī 'vam: pūrvaje iti padam utra kāryubhāktvena<sup>19</sup> no 'cyate<sup>20</sup> yena pāunaruktyam bhavet: kiṁ tu pūrvaj cā 'sau jegabdas ca pūrvaje: etatprabhṛtī 'ty<sup>21</sup> upalakshakatveno<sup>22</sup> 'cyate<sup>23</sup>. nanu tarhy<sup>24</sup> upahāta iti padam atikrūmyā 'yam ity avadhītrena kimartham<sup>25</sup> ucyate: '26upahāta iti padānam bāhulye<sup>26</sup> 'py āsannaṁ saṁdehe (i.25) iti vacanād prāthamikusyāi 'va grahāṇasiddhiḥ<sup>27</sup>. mātī 'vam<sup>28</sup>: upahāta iti padagrahāṇe<sup>28</sup> tatra<sup>29</sup> gauravadoshah:*

nated by the rule as a word possessing the defined quality—which would indeed be a superfluous repetition (in view of rule 11); but it means 'the former *je* of the two,' and is given merely as a convenient limit to count forward from! Again: why, at the end of the passage, is *ayam* pitched upon as limit, to the neglect of *upahātāḥ*; for, though this word is found several times in the immediate sequel, yet, in virtue of the principle already appealed to, "in case of doubt, take the nearest" (125), its first occurrence would be distinctly enough the one intended. This also is disallowed: to quote the whole compound word *upahātāḥ* (*pada*-text, *upa-hātāḥ*) would be to incur the charge of excess; and as for *upa* by itself, the first member of the compound, though it be a *pada*, its *pada* quality is of secondary rank, while that of *ayam* is primary [the latter being a complete word, but the former only a somewhat artificially separated portion of such]; hence, on the principle "where there is a primary, a secondary is not in place," it was proper to cite *ayam*. The answer, however, suggests the further objection that, on the same principle, the first limit is unsuitable [*je* being also a fragment of a word; and its predecessor *hwayate* should have been taken instead]. That cannot be made good, is the reply; for there is a want of suitableness in the primary word suggested: if you take the primary *hwayate*, then, on the supposition that the definition of limits is to be understood inclusively [*a* being susceptible of both an inclusive and an exclusive interpretation], this word [as it ends in *e*] will appear to be cited as a *pragraha*: which is wrong. And if you urge that rule 54 of the chapter annuls this false inference, we reply that, on the principle "not to touch filth is far better than to wash it off," it is better not

*upe* 'ty *etāvanmātrasyā* 'dibhātasyā<sup>2</sup> 'ṇasasya<sup>1</sup> *padatvaṁ gāru-*  
*nam: ayam ity asya tu*<sup>22</sup> *mukhyam: mukhye sambhavati na ga-*  
*nam iti nyāyād ayam iti yuktam grahanam. nanv eteṇi 'va*  
*nyāyend 'dyāvadhē*<sup>23</sup> *anupapannatā. nā 'yam pakṣaḥ: mu-*  
*khyasambhavābhāvāt*<sup>24</sup>: *tathā hi: hwayata iti mukhye svikrte*  
*'bhividhinyāyena tasyā 'pi grahanam*<sup>25</sup> *syāt: tac cā 'nishtam:*  
*ate samānapade (iv.54) iti vacanād etad*<sup>26</sup> *anishtam na*<sup>27</sup> *bha-*  
*vai 'ti*<sup>28</sup> *cet: prakṣhālanād dhi pañkasyā dūrād asparganam*  
*varam iti nyāyād dhwayata ity uccārya tasya nishedhakathanād*  
*api tadanuccāranam eva ramāṇyam*<sup>29</sup>. *iti mukhyasambhavā-*  
*bhāvo 'vastha*<sup>30</sup> *eva: tasmād asmint sūtre 'nupapattilego nā 'sti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -ti ā *ayam*-.; B. -ti ā *ayam*-. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *idam*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *sūtr*-.; G. M. -*yam*-. <sup>6</sup> W. ins. *pūrvaje*. <sup>7</sup> W. *pragrahasya*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> B. om. <sup>11</sup> W. B. *ṛtūvari*-. <sup>12</sup> W. *vidhi*-.; G. M. -*dhītvena*-. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *svikriyāta*-. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *uktāv*-. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *yuktiyuktam*-.; G. M. *yad uktam*-. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> B. O. *tulyam*-. <sup>19</sup> B. O. -*tve*-. <sup>20</sup> B. om. <sup>21</sup> G. M. om. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -*kṣhanat*-. <sup>23</sup> G. M. om. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *kim*-. <sup>25</sup> B. om. <sup>26</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>27</sup> G. M. -*dheh*-. <sup>28</sup> G. M. om. *pada*-. <sup>29</sup> G. M. *sūtra*-. <sup>30</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>31</sup> W. 'ṇasādasya-.; G. M. *ṅgāyān*-. <sup>32</sup> G. M. om. <sup>33</sup> B. O. -*dyapadasya*-. <sup>34</sup> O. G. M. -*khye* s-. <sup>35</sup> G. M. *pragrahatvaṁ*-. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *taḍ*-. <sup>37</sup> G. M. om. <sup>38</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>39</sup> W. *svar*-.; B. O. *varam*-. <sup>40</sup> G. M. *tadav*-.

to quote *hvayate* at all than to quote it and then make it the subject of an exception. The case, then, is one where no suitable primary word is to be found; and not the slightest charge of impropriety can be maintained against the rule as given.

Both parties to this controversy are about equally open to the charge of hair-splitting absurdity; but the objector must be acknowledged to have the right of it so far as this—that the rule is really ambiguous, considering the presence of the two words *pūrvaje*. That *pūrvaje*, as used in it, means ‘the former *je*,’ I do not at all believe.

इमे गर्भमुपैव रसेनपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Also *ime*, when followed by *garbham*, *upa*, and *eva rasena*.

The passages referred to are: *yad ime garbham adadhātām* (iii.4.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), *ime upāvartasyataḥ* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>), and *ime eva rasena nakti* (vi.3.11<sup>3</sup>). Two counter-examples are given: one to show the necessity of *rasena* after *eva*, *ima evā smāi lokāḥ* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and one to show in general the need of specifying the situations in which *ime* is *pragraha*, *adhvartavyā vā ime devdāḥ* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>).

क्रूरमापःसजूर्ब्रह्मज्ञैतेषु च ॥ २५ ॥

25. As also, in the sections beginning with *krūram*, *āpaḥ*, *sajūḥ*, and *brahma ja*.

That is to say, *ime* in the sections specified is always *pragraha*, even when otherwise followed than by the words mentioned in the preceding rule. The commentator quotes the beginning words of each section, and a single example from each: thus, from the section *krūram iva vāi* (v.1.5: only G. M. have the last two words), *rodasyor ity āhe me vāi rodasī* (v.1.5<sup>4</sup>: the only case in the sec-

24. *ime ity antyasvaro garbhaḥ: upa: eva rasena: evamparaḥ padāntaḥ<sup>1</sup> pragrahaḥ syāt. yathā: yad-----: ime-----: ime----- rasene 'ti kim: ima-----: evampara iti kim: adhv-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

25. *ime iti caṣabdo<sup>1</sup> 'nvādiṣati: krūram: āpaḥ: sajūḥ: brahma ja: 'etesho anuvākesho ime ity antyasvaraḥ pūrvoktaparanimit-tābhāve<sup>2</sup> 'pi pragraho bhavati. krā----- ity atra yathā<sup>3</sup>: rod----- āpo----- ity atre 'me-----<sup>2</sup> saj----- ity atra yathā<sup>3</sup>: etaṣa----- brah----- ity atra yathā: na-----: je 'ti kim: brah----- ity atra traya----- ity asya<sup>4</sup> pragrahatvam mā bhūd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *ime*. <sup>(2)</sup> W. jñānesho. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *para*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> B. om.; G. M. *atra*.

tion: B. O. begin the citation at *ime*); from the section *āpo varu-nasyu patnuyāh* (v.5.4: G. M. omit the last word), *ime ero 'pa dhatte* (v.5.4<sup>1</sup>: there are two more cases in the following divisions); from the section *sajūr abāh* (v.6.4: G. M. omit the last word), *etaṣa ime aṣvina saivatsarah* (v.6.4<sup>1</sup>: the only case: only G. M. have the first word); from the section *brahma jajñānam* (v.2.7), *na hī 'me yajushā 'ptum arhati* (v.2.7<sup>4</sup>: the only case: B. O. omit the last word). The last calls for a counter-example, to show the need of including in the rule the syllable after *brahma*: there is another section beginning *brahmarādino vadanty adbhīh* (ii.6.5: B. O. omit *adbhīh*), which contains an *ime* not *pragraha*: *traya ime lokāh* (ii.6.5<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *trayaḥ*).

पूर्णं च ॥ २६ ॥

26. As also *pūrṇe*.

The *ca*, 'and,' in this rule merely brings down the heading of the last *anuvāka* named in the one preceding. In that *anuvāka*, *pūrṇe* is *pragraha*: to wit, in *pūrṇe upa dadhāti pūrṇe evāi 'nam* (v.2.7<sup>4</sup>); but not elsewhere, as for example in *yo vāi pūrṇa āsiñcati* (vii.5.6<sup>1</sup>).

दृढे ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also *dr̥dhe* is *pragraha*.

The restrictions imposed in previous rules no longer hold good: *dr̥dhe* is *pragraha* wherever met with. The example given is *yena dyāur ugrā prthivī ca dr̥dhe* (iv.1.8<sup>5</sup>). There is another case at iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>.

बीचक्रे पपरे ॥ २८ ॥

28. Also *ghnī* and *cakre*, when followed by *p*.

26. *caṣabdo brahmajajñānam ity anuvādiṣati: pūrṇe ity antya-svaro brahmajajñānam ity anuvāke pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>1</sup>: pūrṇe-----<sup>2</sup>asminn anuvāka<sup>3</sup> iti kim: yo-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. G. M. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. O. *brahmaja*.

27. *dr̥dhe ity asminn<sup>1</sup> antyasvaraḥ sarvatra<sup>2</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>3</sup>: yena-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

28. *ghnī: cakre: ity<sup>1</sup> ete pade papare pragrahe<sup>2</sup> bhavataḥ. vār-----: cakre----- papare iti kim: yad-----: stam----- ghnīcakre iti kim: śāk-----: ye----- pakārah<sup>3</sup> paro yābhyāni te papare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-gr̥hye*. <sup>3</sup> W. *paḥ*.

The examples are: *vārtraghnī pūrnāmdse* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>); *cakre prsh-  
thāni* (vi.6.8<sup>1</sup>): I have noted no other cases. We have then two  
pairs of counter-examples, to show that these words are *pragraha*  
before *p* only, and only these words before *p*: the first pair are  
*yad virūpayā vārtraghnī syāt* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>) and *samidhāna cakre nīcā  
tam* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>: only W. has *tam*); the second, *çakā bhāumī pān-  
traḥ* (v.5.18) and *yeshām içe paçupatiḥ* (iii.1.4<sup>1-2</sup>).

न्वती ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also *nvatī*.

Two examples are cited: *omanvatī te 'smin* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit  
the last two words), and *vrdhanvatī amāvāsyāyām* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>): also  
a counter-example, proving that *vatī* alone would not have been  
sufficient: *karnakāvaty etayā* (v.4.7<sup>3</sup>).

पपरो न ॥ ३० ॥

30. But not when followed by *p*

The case here excepted—the only one, so far as I have noticed—is  
*mūrdhanvatī pūronuvākyaḥ bhavati* (ii.6.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last  
word).

समीची ॥ ३१ ॥

31. *Samīcī* is *pragraha*.

For this word, G. M. cite *samīcī retah siñcataḥ* (v.5.4<sup>2</sup>); B. O.  
cite *paçcāt samīcī tābhīḥ* (v.2.3<sup>5</sup>); W. gives both passages. The  
word is met with a dozen times or more in the *Sauhitā*.

नपरो न ॥ ३२ ॥

29. *nvatī ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: om-----  
vrdh----- nakdreṇa kim: karṇ-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antaḥ s-*; O. *antaḥ*-. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

30. *sāmnidhyān nvatī iti<sup>1</sup> labhyate: paparo nvatī ity<sup>2</sup> antya-  
svaraḥ<sup>3</sup> pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>4</sup>: mūr-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> B. *antaḥ s-*; O. *antas*-. <sup>4</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

31. *samīcī ity antyasvaraḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: sam-  
-----: paç-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. *antās-*; O. *antyaḥ s*-. <sup>2</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

32. *sāmnidhyāt samīcī iti labhyate: na khalu samīcī ity antya-  
svaro nakdāraparaḥ<sup>1</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: sam-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. om.



32. But not when followed by *n*.

The case excepted is *saṁcī nāmā 'si* (v.5.10<sup>1</sup>). I have noted no other.

## ची यत्प्रपरः ॥३३॥

33. *Cī* is *pragraha*, when followed by *yat* or *pra*.

The passages had in view by this rule are: *āikshavī tiraçcī yad āçavālah* (vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>: W. O. omit the first word, G. M. B. the last; and B. has the citation out of place, after the next but one), and *prācī pretam udhvaram* (i.2.13<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.9<sup>3</sup>); besides two other cases before *pra* at vi.2.1<sup>5</sup>; 3.9<sup>6</sup>. The commentator gives in addition a number of counter-examples: to show that *cī* is not always *pragraha*, *prācī diçām* (iv.3.3<sup>1</sup> et al.: but W. B. O. read instead *yā prācī dik*, which is not to be found in the Sanhitā: *prācī dik*, without *yā*, occurs at several places, e. g. iv.3.6<sup>2</sup>); to prove the necessity of the *t* of *yat* and the *r* of *pra*, *gāur ghrtācī yajño devān jigāti* (ii.5.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words) and *tas-māt pascāt prācī patny anv āste* (v.3.7<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words); to indicate that other endings than *cī* are not *pragraha* in the situations specified, *yad agnir vajra ekādacinī yad agnīu* (v.5.7<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words) and *prajanane prajananañ hi vāi* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words).

## आन्मही ॥३४॥

34. Also *ān mahī*.

The passage is *mañān mahī astabhāyat* (ii.3.14<sup>6</sup>). Elsewhere, *mahī* is not *pragraha*: e. g. in *mahī dyāuḥ pṛthivī ca naḥ* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit the last two words); and even after *n* preceded by any other vowel than *ā*: e. g. in *vayunāvid eka in mahī devasya* (i.2.13<sup>1</sup> and iv.1.1<sup>1-2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word).

## पती श्रुतिः ॥३५॥

33. *cī ity antyasvaro yatparah praparo vā pragrahaḥ syāt*.  
yathā: āiksh-..... prā-..... evampara itī kim: prā-..... ta-  
kārarephābhyān kim: gāur-..... tas-.....: cī 'ti kim: yad-.....  
praj-.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. bhavati. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

34. *ān ity etadvicishṭe mahīgrahane 'ntyasvarah pragrahaḥ syāt*.  
yathā: mah-..... ān itī kim: mahī-.....: ākāreṇa kim:  
vay-.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. bhavati.

35. Also the combination of sounds *pati*.

The commentator explains: wherever there is *gruti*, i. e. 'hearing,' of *pati*, there we are to understand a case of *pragraha*-quality. Hitherto we have been dealing only with *padas*, or complete individual words; but the *i* of *pati* is uncombinable, even when that audible combination is only a part of a *pada*. The selected examples are, first, *dvāu pati vindate* (vi.6.4<sup>3</sup>) and *gubhas pati idam aham* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), where *pati* is a *pada*; then *yam ācīrā dampati pāmam aṇutah* (iii.2.8<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words) and *priyam indrābrhaspati* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>), where it is part of a *pada*: there are a few other cases.

It is remarked at the end of the comment, that, from this rule on, parts of words are also subjects of prescription of *pragraha*-quality.

मी ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Also *gnī*.

I have noted a number of cases of *gnī* as dual of *agnī* and its compounds. The commentator gives two: *antarāgnī paṇḍām* (i. 6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *viṣvāmītrajamadagnī vasishṭhena* (iii.1.7<sup>3</sup> and v.4.11<sup>3</sup>).

न ह्यपरः ॥ ३७ ॥

37. But not when followed by *hi*.

The case excepted is that of *gnī* occurring as nominative singular feminine of *āindrāgna*: *āindrāgnī hi bārhaspatyā* (v.5.6<sup>2</sup>). The commentator pleads the occurrence of *indrāgnī havāmahe* "in another text," as justification of the rule, in saying "by *hi*," instead of "by *h*." But we may question whether the justification is not officious and uncalled for.

वीड्वारौकृष्णाश्चरावोयदापरः ॥ ३८ ॥

35. *pati ity asya yatra yatra grutiḥ<sup>1</sup> pravaṇam asti tatra tatra pragrahatvaṁ vijñeyam. yathā: dvāu-----: gubh----- grutiḥ iti kim: yam-----: priy----- ity ādāv api<sup>2</sup> paddikadeṣe pragrahatvāya<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*tvam*.

36. *gnī iti pragraho bhavati<sup>1</sup>. yathā: ant-----: viṣv-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

37. *gnī iti sāmīdhyāḥ labhyate: na khalu gnī iti<sup>1</sup> padānto hi paraḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā: āindr----- evampara iti kim: indr----- iti cākhāntare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *api*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

38. Also an *i* or *e* followed by *viḍ*, *dvārāu*, *kṛṣṇaḥ*, *carā-vah*, and *yadā*.

The quoted passages under this rule have each its counter-example. The first is *dhīshane viḍā satī vīdayethām* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup>), a double case; and, to show that *vī* alone would not have been enough, *āpaḥ ca me vīrudhaḥ ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>). Next, *devī dvārāu mā mā* (iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), with *dvādaḥ sam padyante dvādaḥ* (i.5.7<sup>3</sup>), to prove the need of the *rāu* of *dvārāu*. Again, *yajñāyā 'tishthamāne kṛṣṇo rūpaṁ kṛtvā* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word; they also omit the last two words; while B. O. omit *kṛtvā*); and *cātvalē kṛṣṇavishānām prā 'syati* (vi.1.3<sup>8</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words) justifies the *h* of *kṛṣṇaḥ*. Again, *vivasānāu ye carā-vah* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>), with *rāye ca naḥ svapatyāya deva* (v.5.4<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit *deva*) to show that *ca* alone would not have been enough: to prove that more than *car* or *carā* is needed, the commentator does not attempt. Finally, we have *ajanan nannamāne: yade 'dam tāh* (iv.6.2<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *ajanan*). To this is raised the question whether *yatante*, as coming before *yad ā* in *greṇiḥo yatante yad ākshishur divyam* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), is not also *pragraha*? The answer is an appeal to rule i.50, "in citations of *padas*, a *pada* only is to be understood:" but how we are to know that an integral *pada* is meant to be signified by *yadā*, any more than by *viḍ*, the commentator does not inform us.

न ज्ञे ऽह्ने नित्यम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39. But not *jñe* and *ahne*, under any circumstances.

The passages quoted in illustration of the rule are *varunāya rājñe kṛṣṇaḥ* (v.5.11), and *vanuspatinām eṇyahne kṛṣṇaḥ* (v.5.15: only G. M. have the first word): these are both exceptions to the preceding rule, and are the immediate occasion of the

38. ----- 'ity evampara' ikāra ekāro vā ' pragraho bhavati'.  
yathā: dhīsh-----: ḍakāreṇa' kim: āpaḥ-----: devī-----: rāu  
iti kim: dvāda-----: yaj-----: visargena kim: cāt-----: viv-  
-----: rāva iti kim: rāye-----: aj-----: nanu' gre----- ity  
atra pragrahatvaṁ kim nā syāt. paḍagrahaṇeṣu paḍaṁ  
gamyeta (i.50) iti' vacanān na bhavati' 'ti brāmaḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. eshu pareshu. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. padāntah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. G. M. om.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. viḍ iti. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. atra. <sup>8</sup> W. pravartate; G. M. om.

39. jñe: ahne: ity' etayor antyasvaro nityam pragraho na  
syāt. yathā: var-----: van-----: vīdādi (iv.38) prāptir ana-  
yoh. nityaḥ abdaḥ prāptyantarapratibandhakah'. yathā: yaj-  
-----: gamayatobhāvataḥ (iv.52) ity ādinā prāptiḥ: sva-  
-----: somāyasva (iv.48) iti prāptiḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. -pratishedh-; G. M. prāptyānishedhaprayojanakah. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

introduction here of this one. But the addition of *nītyam*, 'constantly, in all cases,' excepts the same words from the action of any other rule: for example, of rules 52 and 48, which would otherwise apply in the passages *yajñe 'pi kartor iti tāv abratām* (ii.6.7<sup>1</sup>) and *svarājñe 'novāhāu* (v.6.21).

## आकारैकारपूर्वस्तु बहुस्वरस्य ते थे ॥४०॥

40. *Te* and *the*, however, are *pragraha* in a word of more than two syllables, if preceded by *ā* or *e*.

The class of words here aimed at, of course, is composed of second and third persons plural of present and perfect tenses middle of verbs. The commentator quotes several instances: *etasmīn vā etāu mrjāte yo vidvishānayoḥ* (ii.2.6<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words, and they omit the last word); *śukrā manthindū grhyete* (vi.4.10<sup>1</sup>); *pra prthivyā riricāthe divaḥ ca* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first and the last two words); and *dr̥ṇhānā yām nudethe* (iv.7.15<sup>2</sup>). Then, to justify the requirement of a preceding *ā* or *e*, we have given us *ā vṛçyate vā etad yajamānaḥ* (iii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); of a polysyllabic word, *tat pravāte vi śhajanti* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>: see under i.48) and *yad ete grhyante* (iii.3.6<sup>1</sup>); the restriction to the endings *te* and *the*, *anūcyamāna ā sādāyati* (ii.2.5<sup>7</sup>, 11<sup>1</sup>).

As to the special significance of *tu*, 'however,' in this rule, two of our commentator's three chief authorities, Vararuci and Māhishēya, are reported by him as at variance. The former maintains that it indicates the cessation of regard had to the words specified in rule 38 as occasions of *pragraha*-quality; the latter, that it prescribes the annulment of continued implication of the exceptions mentioned in rule 39, and of what was there signified by the word *nītyam*. Vararuci's view is declared the better one, and with good reason—unless, indeed, we prefer to ascribe to the word a general change of subject, from mention of individual words to the description of a class.

40. *bahusvarasya padasya sambandhī te iti the iti vā* \* "kāra-pūrva ekārapūrvo vā pragraho bhavati. yathā: et-----: *śuk*-----: *prā*-----: *dr̥ṇh*----- *evampūrva iti kim: ā vṛç*-----: *tr̥ṇi*-----: *bahusvarasye 'ti kim: tat*-----: *yad*-----: *tethe iti kim: anūc*-----: *vīdādi* (iv.38) *nimittasāpekshatānivartakas tu çabda iti vararucipakṣaḥ: māhishēyapakṣas tu vakṣyate*: *pūrvasātroktaṇishedhanitya çabdajñāpitānūvrttiṃ* \* *nivārayati* \* *'ti*: *tatra* \* *vararucimatām ruciram. bahavaḥ svarā yasmin tad bahusvaram: tasya. atra svara çabdopādānāc* \* *ca* \* *bahuçabdena vyaktibhedo vijñeyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*dhīya*. \* G. M. ins. *çabdah*. \* G. M. *ucyate*. \* G. M. -*dhām nūt*. \* G. M. *vār*-. \* G. M. om. \* G. M. *atra*. \* W. *bahusvara çabdopādānatā*; B. O. *bahusvararūpa çabdena upādānatā*. \* W. B. O. om.

The commentator's final remark as to *bahusvarasya* is obscure to me.

न शार्यते ॥४१॥

41. But not *çaryâte*.

Namely, in the passage *çaryâte apibah sutasya* (i.4.18: G. M. omit the last word). An exception to the preceding rule, by express mention of the excepted word.

ते मापातंनमश्नमभिवायुर्गर्भमुपाहस्तुपरः ॥४२॥

42. *Te* is *pragraha* when followed by *mâ pātam*, *namah*, *enam abhi*, *vāyuh*, *garbham*, *upa*, *ahas*, and *tu*.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: *vām ā rabhe te mā patam ā'syā* (i.2.2<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first three words), with *te mā'smin yajñe* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>), to show the necessity of including *pātam* in the rule; *punas te: namo 'gnaye 'pratividdhāya* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), with *te na vy'ajayanta* (v.4.1<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *na* alone would not have been enough; *te enam abhi sam anahyetām* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>), with *ta enam bhishajyanti brahmanuh* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: W. omits the last word), to justify the inclusion of *abhi*; *te vāyur vy avāt* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), with *te vācāñ striyam* (vi.1.6<sup>5</sup>), to show why the *yuh* of *vāyuh* was needed; *te garbham adadhātām* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>), without any counter-example to prove that *ga* would not have answered the purpose; *te upā 'mantrayanta* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te ahorātrayoh* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>); *te tv āva no 'tsrjye ity āhuḥ* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), with *te te dhāmāny ugmasi* (i.3.6<sup>1</sup>), to show that *t* not followed by *u* is not enough to determine the *pragraha* quality. Then, as further counter-examples, we have *te devāh* (i.4.10<sup>1</sup> et al.) in proof that *te* is not *pragraha* before other words than those here mentioned; and *brhad ukshe namah* (i.4.26), *amushmin loka upa çere* (v.3.7<sup>2</sup>), and *yanti*

41. *çaryāta ity antyasvarah<sup>1</sup> pragraho na<sup>2</sup> bhavati. yathā: çār----- pārvasātraprāpti<sup>3</sup> satyām kanthoktanishedho<sup>4</sup> 'nena<sup>5</sup> vidhīyate.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -yah s-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -treṇa pr-; B. -tre pr-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -ktyā n-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

42. <sup>1</sup>----- *evamparas te iti çabdah pragrahaḥ syāt. yathā<sup>2</sup>: vām-----: pātam iti kim: te-----: punas-----: mā iti kim: te-----: te e-----: abhi<sup>3</sup> 'ti kim: ta-----: te v-----: yur iti kim: te v-----: te ga-----: te u-----: te āh-----: te tv-----: ukd-rena kim: te te-----: evampara iti kim: te d-----: te iti kim: brh-----: am-----: yanti-----.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. ias. te. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

*vā ete savanādye 'haḥ* (vii.5.6<sup>3</sup>), showing that only *te* is *pragraha* in the situations defined.

These are not all the instances found in the Saṃhitā of *te* as *pragraha*; one was disposed of by rule 20 above, and at least one or two others come under the action of other rules of this chapter.

## अनुदात्तो न नित्यम् ॥ ४३ ॥

43. But not when unaccented, under any circumstances.

That is to say, even in such a situation as would bring it otherwise under the preceding rule. The example quoted is *bāhu-bhyām uta te namaḥ* (iv.5.1<sup>1</sup>): if the text contains others, I have failed to notice them. The specification *nityam* has its usual force, as suspending the application of all rules to the contrary, wherever found: for example, that of rule 52, below, in the passage *namas te astv dyudhāya* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>).

## एते तनुवौवैसमेवहियज्ञपदिष्टकपरः ॥ ४४ ॥

44. *Ete* is *pragraha* when followed by *tanuvāu*, *vāi sam*, *eva*, *hi*, *yajña*, *pad*, and *ishtak*.

The passages, as quoted by the commentator, are: *tasyāi 'te tanuvāu* (v.7.3<sup>3</sup>); *ete vāi samvatsarasya cakshushī* (ii.5.6<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), with *ete vā idāyāi stanah* (i.7.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word) as counter-example, showing that before *vāi* not followed by *sam* the word is not *pragraha*; *sa ete eva namasyann upā 'dhavat* (ii.5.6<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first word, and they omit the last two); *ete hi devānām* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>: another case at vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); *cakshushī vā ete yajñasya* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.: compare also the nearly identical passage vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>); *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v.1.6<sup>3-4</sup>: W. omits the first word); and *yad ete ishtake upada-dhāti* (v.3.5<sup>2</sup>). Counter-examples would have been in place to show that, in citing the last three fragments of words, the rule had taken no more than just what was sufficient for its purpose; but

43. *mā pātam ityādīparo 'pi te ity antyasvaro*<sup>1</sup> 'nudātto nityam *pragraho na bhavati. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *bāh----- nityam iti kin: lakṣaṇāntaraprāptasyā 'pi pratishedho*<sup>3</sup> *yathā syāt: na----- ga-mayatobhavataḥ* (iv.52) *ity ādinā prāptih*.

<sup>1</sup> O. -yah sv-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. nish-. <sup>4</sup> O. G. M. om.; B. antya.

44. <sup>1</sup> ----- *ity evampara ete ity antyasvaraḥ padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā*: *tas----- ete----- sam iti kin: ete----- sa----- ete----- cak----- yaj----- yad-----* <sup>2</sup> *evampara iti kin: atha----- ete iti kin: man----- push----- agre-----* *sapt-----*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> B. O. ins. *ete*. <sup>2</sup> O. -yah s-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om.

they are not furnished. The general counter-examples under this rule, like those under the last but one, proving that only *ete* is *pragraha* before the words specified, and *ete* itself before them only, are given by G. M., but omitted in the other manuscripts: they are *atha kātama ete devā iti* (ii.6.9<sup>3</sup>), *manuta evāi 'nam etāni* (v.5.6<sup>1</sup>), *pushkaraparne hy enam upagritam* (v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: MSS. -*gru-tam*), *agre yajñapatiṁ dhatta* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>), and *saptame pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>).

परश्च द्वयोः ॥ ४५ ॥

45. As also, the letter following the two last mentioned.

The "two" of the rule are *pad* and *ishṭak*; and the commentator makes the further obvious specification that the letter following them is *pragraha* only when they themselves follow *ete*, as prescribed in the preceding rule. He quotes the passages referred to: *yajñasya hy ete pade atho* (v.1.6.<sup>3-4</sup>: W. omits to *pade*, B. O. to *ete*), and *yad ete ishṭake upadadhāti* (v.3.5<sup>2</sup>); adding, to show the necessity of the limitation made by him, the counter-examples *saptame pade juhoti* (vi.1.8<sup>1</sup>), and *tasyās te devī 'shṭake* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>).

स्यःपरः ॥ ४६ ॥

46. Also one followed by *sthaḥ*.

There is a natural reason for this rule, *sthaḥ* being a dual verb, and so, apt to be preceded by a dual noun. I have noted near a dozen cases in the text; the one cited in illustration by the commentator is *vishnoḥ snyaptre sthaḥ* (i.2.13<sup>3</sup>). To show that *stha* instead of *sthaḥ* would not answer, is given *etusmiṇ loke stha yu-shmāṇs te 'nu* (iii.2.5<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last three).

परश्चोभयोः ॥ ४७ ॥

47. As also, one following them both.

Following, namely, a *sthaḥ* and a preceding *pragraha* word: for example, *cilpe sthas te vām ā rabhe* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup>: but this citation is wanting in G. M.), and *dṛdhe sthaḥ githire samici* (iii.2.4<sup>3</sup>). A counter-example, of a word following *sthaḥ* only, is *vṛshanānu stha urvaḥ* (i.3.7<sup>1</sup>).

45. *nimittina upari vartamānayoḥ padishṭakḥsubdayoḥ<sup>1</sup> para<sup>2</sup> 'ikāra ekāro vā<sup>3</sup> pragraho bhavati. yathā: yaḥ-----: yad----- nimittina upari vartamānayoḥ iti kim: sapt-----: tas-----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *dvayoḥ padishṭak ity etayoḥ cakārānvādishtayoḥ*; G. M. *pat ishtaka ity etayoḥ cakārānvādishtayoḥ dvayoḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *parata*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *om*.

46. *stha ity evampara ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: vish----- visargena kim: et-----.*

The commentator then proceeds to point out that the difference in phraseology between this rule and the last but one—*dvayoh*, 'two,' being used in the one, and *ubhayoh*, 'both,' in the other—indicates a difference of meaning. Above, the two affecting causes (*nimitta*) specified in the preceding rule, each along with the word affected by it (*nimittin*), were intended; here, on the other hand, the two aimed at are an affecting and an affected word.

सोमायस्वैतस्मिन् ॥ ४८ ॥

48. Also in the section beginning *somāya sva*.

The section in question is v.6.21: it was necessary to add *sva*, in order to distinguish it from that beginning *somāya pīrmate* (i.8.5). It contains thirteen *pragrahas*, of which the commentator cites several together: *avī dve dhenā bhāumī* (v.6.21<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *bhāumī*): three of these, however, would be disposed of by the three rules next following.

द्वे ॥ ४९ ॥

49. Also *dve*.

This word, which occurs about forty times in the *Tāittiriya* text, is, of course, always *pragraha*. The commentator cites two instances: *dvedve sam bharati* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>), and *yad dve naçyetām* (ii.6.3<sup>3</sup>).

परश्च ॥ ५० ॥

47. *cakārānoādishṭayoh pūrvasātroktaninimittaninimittinor<sup>1</sup> ubhayoh para ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: pīl----- dṛḍhe----- ubhayor iti kim: vṛsh----- paraç ca dvayor (iv.45) iti<sup>2</sup> vācya ubhayor iti çabdānturam<sup>3</sup> arthānturajñāpakam<sup>4</sup>: nimittisahitayoh<sup>5</sup> pūrvasātroktayor nimittayoh paraḥ pragraho bhavati: paraç ca dvayor (iv.45) iti sūtrārthaḥ: atra tu<sup>6</sup> sūtre nimittaninimittinor<sup>7</sup> ubhayoh paraḥ pragrahaḥ syād iti viçeshād<sup>8</sup> bhedo vijñeyah.<sup>9</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *pūrvokta*. <sup>2</sup> B. ins. *kim ca*, O. ins. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-taraprayogah*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-kah*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-ttas-*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-tinimittayoh*. <sup>8</sup> B. *-shana*; O. *-shena*; G. M. *vishaya*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *drashtavyah*.

48. *somāya svarājñe* (v.6.21) *ity asminn anuvāka ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati. yathā: avī---- ity ādi. sve 'ti kim: somāya pīrmate* (i.8.5) *ity atra mā bhūd iti.*

49. *dve ity antyasvaraḥ padāntaḥ<sup>1</sup> sarvatra pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve----- yad-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.



50. As also, the following word.

The comment instances but one case, a double one: *dve gukle dve kṛshne mūrdhanvatīh* (v.3.1<sup>4</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). Of such the text contains more than a dozen, but they are not worth referring to in detail.

एकव्यवेतो ऽपि ॥ ५१ ॥

51. Likewise the next but one.

The *api*, 'likewise,' in this rule is explained as bringing forward *dve* from the last rule but one; another application of the "principle of the frog's leap." The cited examples are *dve hy ete devate* (ii.1.9<sup>3</sup>: but G. M. omit this citation), and *dve vāva devasatre* (vii.4.5<sup>1</sup>). By rule i.48, *devasatre*, though a divisible compound (*pada*-text; *devdsatre iti deva-satre*), is reckoned as but a single *pada* for the purposes of this precept: another like case, *dve savane gukravati* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>), was expressly quoted as an illustration under the former rule. At vi.6.4<sup>3</sup> (*dve jāye vindute*) is a case where the action of the rule is suspended by a later one, iv.54.

गमयतोभवतोऽनूकारात्परंतनूयदकरोत्कुर्यादिष्टिष्वब्रू-  
तांप्रवर्तास्तास्तभीतांवाचयतिविभृतस्ताग्निगायत्रंताभ्या-  
मेवोभाभ्यामब्राह्मणपर आ षष्ठात् ॥ ५२ ॥

52. Before, and within six words of, *gamayatah, bhavatah* (except when it follows *ū*), *tanū yāt, akarot, kuryāt* (in *ishti* passages), *abrūtām, pra varta, āstām, stabhnītām, vācayati, bibhrtas ta, agnih gāyatram, tābhyām eva, ubhābhyām, and avāntaram.*

Of the words here specified, some are duals, and so would naturally have other duals, with *pragraha* endings, in their vicinity; in other cases, the collocation is purely accidental.

The *ā* in the rule is declared to be intended this time "inclusively" (*tena saha*, 'along with the specified limit:' compare the scholiast to Pāṇini ii.1.13); and the necessity of the specification

50. *cakāro dve ity anvādiṣati: dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. *asmāt*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *syāt*; G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

51. *ekavyaveto<sup>1</sup> 'pi dve ity etasmāt para ikāra ekāro vā padāntaḥ pragraho bhavati<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: dve-----: dve----- ekena padena<sup>4</sup> vyaveta<sup>5</sup> ekavyavetaḥ. apicabdo dve ity anvādiṣati man-  
dūkaphlutinyāyena.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *-vahiṭo*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. *vyavakita*.

“within six words” is explained as arising from rule i.30, which would limit the meaning of “before” to ‘the word standing next before.’ This involves a misinterpretation of the rule referred to, which was made for quite another purpose (see the note upon it). No such special and technical ground is needed to justify the terms of the present rule, which are of obvious and incontestable propriety.

The commentator’s example for *gamayataḥ* is *te evāi ’nam pratishtān gamayataḥ* (ii.1.4<sup>7</sup>): I have noted no other case. For *bhavataḥ*, he gives *uttarāvati bhavataḥ* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>); with the counter-example *dikshante ’ntanāmānāv rta bhavataḥ* (vii.4.8<sup>1</sup>); to show the necessity of the restriction imposed by the rule in the case of this word. There are quite a number of other passages where *bhavataḥ* assures the *pragraha*-quality to words in its neighborhood: I have noted ii.2.2<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>4-5</sup>; 3.2<sup>9</sup>, 3<sup>5</sup>, 4<sup>3,4</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>; iii.1.7<sup>2</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>; 5.4<sup>4</sup>; v.4.6<sup>3</sup>; 5.1<sup>2</sup>; vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>3</sup> twice. With regard to the limitation *anākārāt*, the commentator remarks that although simple absence is the primary significance of its negative prefix, yet another meaning is here assumed, in accordance with the requirements of the case: that is to say, “after a not-*a*” is to be understood as ‘after any letter but *a*.’ For *tanu yat*, we have *ete vāi mahāyajñasya ’ntyē tanu yat* (ii.2.7<sup>5</sup>: I have found no other case); and, as counter-example, to justify the inclusion of *yat*, *paripataye tvā grhṇāmi tanūnaptre tvā* (i.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only W. has the last word). For *akarot*, *budhnavati agravati yājyānuvākye akarot* (ii.3.4<sup>3</sup>: another case at ii.2.8<sup>5</sup>). For *kuryāt*, *mānavi reḍu dhāyye kuryāt* (ii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: another case at ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>); with the counter-example *agnaye dātre pūrōdācam ashtākāpālūn kuryāt* (ii.5.5<sup>2</sup>), to explain the restriction to *ishti*-passages. The *ishtis* are defined as being “the three *pragnas* beginning with the tenth, but excepting their final *anurākas*” (which have before received the designation *yājyā*): that is to say, ii.2.1–11; 3.1–13; 4.1–13. There are other passages besides the one quoted proving the necessity of the restriction in question: thus v.4.7<sup>7</sup>; vii.5.5<sup>1</sup>. For *abrātām* is cited *te abrātām varān vṛṇāvahāi* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>, 6<sup>5</sup>: another case at v.2.3<sup>3</sup>). For *pravarta*, *huvirdhātne prāci pravartayeyuh* (iii.1.3<sup>1</sup>); with the counter-

52. *gamayataḥ*: *bhavato ’nākārāt*: *ākāravyatiriktavarṇāt param bhavata iti*<sup>1</sup>: *yady apy abhāvo mukhyārthas tathā ’pi tad anyārthatā<sup>2</sup> svikṛtā<sup>3</sup> lukshyānusārāt*: *tanu yat*: *akarot*: *kuryāt* *ishtishu*: *ishtayo*<sup>4</sup> *dācamādāyas trayāḥ pragna uttamānuvāka-varjitāḥ*<sup>5</sup>: *abrātām*: ----- *ity evampara ā shashthāt padāt pūrvo vartumāna ikāru ekāro vā pudāntaḥ pragraho bhavati*<sup>6</sup>. *abhi-vidhāv ayan ākārah*: *tena sahe ’ty abhi-vidhiḥ*. *yathā*: *te*-----: *utt*-----: *anākārāt param iti kim*: *diksh*-----: *ete*-----: *yad iti kim*: *pari*-----: *budh*-----: *mān*-----: *ishtishv iti kim*: *agn*-----: *te*-----: *hav*-----: *varte* ’*ti kim*: *te*-----: *ime*-----: *vāci*-----: *utt*-----: *tē*-----: *te* ’*ti kim*: *manm*-----: *ete*-----: *gāya-*

example *te 'dityāñ sam adhriyanta tvayā prajāndme 'ti* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. end at *pra*), to show why *varta* was added to *pra*. For *āstām, ime vāi sahā 'stām* (iii.4.3<sup>1</sup>: another case at iv.3.10<sup>2</sup>). For *stabhnītām, vāigvadevāgnimārute ukthe avyathayanti stabhnītām* (iv.4.2<sup>3</sup>). For *vācayati, uttame ādumbari vācayati* (v.1.10<sup>2-3</sup>). For *bibhrtas ta, te eva yajamānasya reto bibhrtas tasmāt* (v.6.8<sup>4</sup>); with the counter-example *manmahe yāv ātmanvad bibhṛto yāu* (iv.7.15<sup>5</sup>), to show that *bibhrtas* alone would not have answered the purpose of the rule. Doubtless the single case is provided for in this rule rather than in 42, above, because there are cases of *ta eva* in the *Sanhitā* which it would have made trouble to distinguish properly from this one. For *agnim gāyatram, ete dadhāte ye agnim gāyatram* (vi.3.5<sup>3</sup>); with the counter-example *sadhashe 'gnim purishyam* (iv.1.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that the addition of *gāyatram* was needful. For *tābhyām eva, ete vāi yajñasyā 'ñjasdyani sruti. tābhyām eva* (vii.2.1<sup>2</sup>; 3.5<sup>2</sup>, 7<sup>3</sup>, 9<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>). With reference to this passage, the commentator raises the difficulty that *ete*, one of the words intended to be determined as *pragraha*, is not within six words of *eva*, one of the two words specified in the rule as conditioning its *pragraha*-character within that distance; but he declares it of no account, since what is within reach of any part of the assigned cause (*nimitta*) is within reach of that cause in its entirety. For, he says, in common life also, a quality belonging to a part is ascribed to the whole which contains that part: for example, people say "Devadatta has an ear-ring," when it is really his ear that has the ring. Truly a most lucid and convincing illustration! The necessity of the *eva* is proved by the counter-example *apa hañsy agne tābhyām patema* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ubhābhyām, ye dve ahorātre eva te ubhābhyām* (vii.4.4<sup>4</sup>). Finally, for *avāntaram, utsriye ity āhur ye avāntaram* (vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); with the counter-example *sam te 'va te hedaḥ* (ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *ava* would not have been enough alone.

## न ग्रामीवर्चसीमिथुनीमासेलोकेधत्ते ॥ ५३ ॥

53. But not *grāmī, varcasī, mithunī, māse, loke, dhatte*.

*tram'iti kim: sadh-----: ete----- atra padadvayam ekaṁ<sup>8</sup> nimittam ity<sup>8</sup> etepadam<sup>10</sup> uddiṣyā "shashṭhanīyanabhaṅgaprasaṅga ity cet: "nā 'yam bhaṅgaprasaṅgaḥ<sup>11</sup>: nimittādikadeḥasya shashṭhatvopapatteḥ sakalasyā 'pi nimittasya<sup>12</sup> shashṭhatvam upapadyate: loke 'py avayavadharmenā 'vayavino 'pi<sup>13</sup> visheshasiddheḥ: tathā hi: karṇe kuṇḍalanā dhārayantam kuṇḍali devadatta ity vadanti. eve 'ti kim: apa-----: ye-----: ut-----: antaram ity kim: sam-----: ā shashṭhād ity kim: para ity uttaraḥ (i.30) ity paribhāshayā 'nantarasya'ī 'va paratvaṁ syāt: tan mā bhūd iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *padam nañō*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*tām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*kārya*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *nāma*.

<sup>5</sup> G. M. -*karahitāḥ*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. B. O. *ste*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *etan*. <sup>9</sup> O. *eve 'ty*.

<sup>10</sup> O. *etat p-*. <sup>11</sup> B. O. *māi 'vam pras-*; G. M. om. *bhaṅga*. <sup>12</sup> W. O. -*syā 'pi*.

<sup>13</sup> B. O. G. M. om.

These are words which, occurring within six of those mentioned in the last rule, would be *pragraha* if not thus specially excepted. The commentator quotes the passages in which they occur, as follows: *grāmy eva bhavati gṇavati yājyānucākye bhavataḥ* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>; another nearly identical case is found at ii.2.11<sup>4</sup>); *brahmararāśy eva bhavaty ubhayato rukmāu bhavataḥ* (ii.3.2<sup>3</sup>); *atha mithunī bhavataḥ* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>); *pūrṇamāse prā yachot tār abratām* (ii.5.2<sup>3</sup>); *loke pratitishthanto yanti dvāu śaḍāhāu bhavataḥ* (vii.4.11<sup>3</sup>); and *dhatte jyotishmantāv asmā imāu lokāu bhavataḥ* (ii.6.2<sup>4</sup>).

## अते समानपदे नित्यमवे चावे च ॥५४॥

54. Nor *ate*, in a single word, nor *ave*, under any circumstances.

After paraphrasing the rule, in a way which shows that he regards the specifications "in a single word" and "under any circumstances" as both alike referring to each of the "parts of words" mentioned, the commentator proceeds to cite illustrative passages, as follows: *ava rundhate tīrśtrāv abhito bhavataḥ* (vii.2.6<sup>3</sup>; 4.1<sup>3</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, 3<sup>6</sup>; another nearly identical case is found at vii.4.5<sup>4</sup>); *abhyāhvayate vajram enam abhi pra vartayati* (iii.2.9<sup>1,7</sup>); and *anātātāya dhr̥shnave: ubhābhyām uta te namaḥ* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>; B. O. omit the last word, and G. M. the last two). To show the necessity of specifying that *ate* should form part of a single word, he quotes *eva te ubhābhyām* (vii.4.4<sup>3</sup>). The limitation *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' is explained in the usual manner, as intended to exclude the operation of other rules besides the one (iv.52) here especially aimed at: for the appropriate examples we are referred to the comment upon rule i.59, where they are given in connection with the illustration of another point.

53. ----- *eteshu<sup>1</sup> antyasvaro gamayato bhavata ityādiparo<sup>2</sup> pi pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>3</sup>: grā-----: brah-----: atha-----: pār-----: loke-----: dhatte-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*.

54. *nishedham cakāro nradīṣati. ate: ave: ity unayoḥ padāi-kaḍeṣayor antyasvaraḥ samānapade vartamāno gamayato bhavata ityādiparo pi nityam pragraho na bhavati. yathā<sup>1</sup>: ava-----: abhy-----: anā-----: samānapada iti kim: eca-----: atra nityaḥ abdaḥ prāptyantaraparihārārthaḥ. udāharanam<sup>2</sup> upabandhas tu dēcāya (i.59) iti sūtre<sup>3</sup> prasaṅgād uktam. samānam ca tat pūdan ca samānapadam: tasmint samānapade<sup>4</sup>.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyaivivaraṇe  
caturtho dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *om*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *iti sodā*. <sup>3</sup> W. *sūtreṇa*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *om*.

This finishes the rehearsal of the words with *pragraha*-endings contained in the *Sanhitā*. As to the economy of the method of their rehearsal—whether it would have been possible to state the facts in fewer or briefer rules—I cannot speak with confidence: it would be, certainly, a thankless task to endeavor to recast them in an improved form. Nor can I, without a *pada*-manuscript, or a much more thorough and detailed study of the text, with the aid of a commentary, than it has been in my power to make, judge absolutely the success of the method followed. It appears, however (with exception of the equivocal treatment of the words in *o*, pointed out under rule 7), to be complete: my excerption of the text has shown me no *pragraha*-endings in *i* and *e* which are not duly taken account of, nor any case of final *i* or *e* not *pragraha* as involved in the general rules of the chapter without being duly excepted by special precept. One or two words whose endings are treated as uncombinable without being *pragraha* are disposed of in another chapter (x.18).

## CHAPTER V.

CONTENTS: 1-2, introductory, relation of *pada* and *saṁhitā* texts; 3, order of application of rules; 4-8, anomalous insertions of a sibilant and *d*; 9-10, anomalous conversions of *r* and *h*; 11-19, anomalous omissions of *v*, *s*, *h*, *m*, and *yā*; 20-24, treatment of final *n* and *t* before palatal letters; 25-26, before *l*; 27-31, of final *m* before a consonant; 32-33, of final *ś*, *ṣ*, *n* before sibilants; 34-37, of initial *r* after consonants; 38-41, of initial *h* after consonants.

### अथ संहितायामेकप्राणभावे ॥ १ ॥

1. The following rules apply in combined text (*saṁhitā*), within the compass of a single breath.

This is an introductory heading to the main part of the *Prātīkhyā*—the rules for the construction of the euphonically combined text (*saṁhitā*) from its presupposed material, the *pada*-text, where

1. *athe 'ty ayaṁ adhikārah: saṁhitāyām ekapṛāṇabhāva ity etad adhikṛtaṁ vedītavyam ita uttarāṁ yad vakshyāmaḥ. saṁhite 'ti ko 'rthah: nānāpadasaṁdhānasamযোগ' (xxiv.3) iti 'sātreṇo 'ktaḥ' saṁhitārthah: parah saṁnikarśah saṁhite 'ti vāidyākuraṇḍā' pathanti'. ekasamutthah pṛāṇa ekapṛāṇah: tasya bhāvas tadbhāvah: tasmin: ity ātreyaṁatam. anyathā 'pi saṁdśah saṁgachate: ekapṛāṇena bhāvyaṭe janyata uccāryata ity ekapṛāṇabhāvaḥ: ekeno 'chvāsena yāvān uccāryate vedabdhāgas tāvān ekapṛāṇabhāva ity arthah: ata evā 'vasāne padavi-*

each word stands separate, as if occurring independently. It is a rule of far-reaching force, applying through many chapters (for an attempt to define precisely how far, see the comment to xxiv.2). The matters treated in the first two chapters—the mode of utterance of elementary sounds, definitions, general explanatory precepts, and the like—were with propriety first disposed of; the separate rehearsal of the *pragraha*-endings, made in chapter iv., is more questionable, but defensible on the ground that these endings exhibit their *pragraha* character also in the *pada*-text, before *iti*: but the exclusion of the vowels irregularly protracted in *saṁhitā*, as rehearsed in the third chapter, is quite anomalous (see note to iii.1).

The commentator defines *saṁhitā* by quoting a later rule (xxiv.3), which declares it to be “the union of separate words in euphonic combination;” referring at the same time to the rule of Pāṇini (i.4.109), as the account of it given by “the grammarians.” For *ekapráṇabhāve* he first gives us Ātreya’s simple paraphrase; but then goes on to explain it more fully, as “that which is brought about, generated, uttered, with a single breath; such portion of the Veda, namely, as is uttered by the help of one expiration—the condition of *pada*, or separated and euphonic independent words, recurring with the pause that follows the expiration. That is to say, if the repeater of the text has to pause to take breath where there is no regular *avasāna*, or pause of interpolation (such as separates the *pādas* of a verse: its length is taught in rule xxii.13), his last word is thrown out of *saṁdhi* with the next, and the end of the one and the beginning of the other must assume their *pada* form.

Now is interposed an objection: of what use are the two specifications “in combined text” and “within the compass of a single breath”? the former is enough by itself. To this it is replied: if the latter specification were not made, then no pause after a *pada* would be authorized in the continuous *saṁhitā* arrangement: and if the other were not made, then that respecting the single breath would apply also to the *pādas*; hence doubt would arise as to where any direction to be given would have force: there is, therefore, good reason for the double specification.

*dhīḥ. nanu saṁhitāyām ity etāvatāi 'vā' 'īam: ekapráṇabhāva iti vā ubhayārambhānena<sup>6</sup> kim. ucyate<sup>7</sup>: ekapráṇabhāva ity anárabhyamāṇe pravṛttasya saṁhitāvidheḥ padāvasānatvaṁ ne 'shyate: saṁhitāyām ity anárabhyamāṇe tu padeshv apy ekapráṇabhāva upapadyata iti<sup>10</sup> vakshyamānaṁ<sup>11</sup> kāryaṁ kva<sup>12</sup> bhavati 'ti saṁdehaḥ syāt: tasmād<sup>13</sup> asminn<sup>14</sup> ubhayārambhāne<sup>15</sup> prayojanam asti.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. -*nayoga*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *sūtrokta*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *saṁhitā* 'ty ar-. <sup>4</sup> W. B. G. *vāṇiyā*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *bhāṇanti*. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> B. O. om. *eva*. <sup>8</sup> B. O. -*bhēpa*; G. M. -*bhane*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. om. <sup>11</sup> B. G. M. -*ṇa*. <sup>12</sup> B. O. G. M. *kutra vā*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *tadā*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *tas*. <sup>15</sup> O. G. M. -*bhe*; W. B. -*bhēpa*.

## यथायुक्ताद्विधिः सा प्रकृतिः ॥२॥

2. Separation from the text as combined—that is the fundamental text.

I cannot but believe the intent of this precept to be the same with that of the rule which begins the second chapter of the Rik Pr., *samhitā padaprakṛtiḥ*, 'the *pada*-text is the foundation of the *samhitā*:' but such intent is not readily and distinctly deducible either from the rule itself or from its commentary. The latter explains that hereby is taught the *prakṛti*, or proper form, of *samhitā*, the reason being that a later rule (xxiv.5) prescribes as necessary to be understood, among other things, "*prakṛti, vikrama, krama*." An arrangement which does not deviate from the *pada*-text as constituted, taken as supreme, that is to be regarded as the fundamental text. By way of illustration is then quoted the whole series of passages falling under the action of rule x.13, below; passages in which the fundamental or *pada* form of certain words is maintained, against the ordinary rules of euphonic combination: they are *śvadhā asy urvī cā 'si* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *dhanvaṇṇa iva prapā asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>), *śahasrasya pramā asi* (iv.4.11<sup>5</sup>: G. M. put this citation before the preceding one), *pra budhniyā irute* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>), *jyā iyañ samane* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>), *ā pāśhā etu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>: W. B. O. omit this), and *aminanta evāhi* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>). No explanation is attempted of the bearing of these examples upon the principle which is laid down in the rule now in hand: we may suppose it to be that, the application of the rules of *sandhi* being denied in the case of these particular words, they remain in *samhitā* in their regular or natural shape as shown in *pada*-text—*prakṛtyā*, as it is elsewhere termed. And in this office of the precept is to be seen the real ground of its statement, rather than in a provision against the requirements of xxiv.5.

The grand difficulty in this exposition lies in its quiet postulation of *avicalitaḥ*, 'unremoved, not deviating,' as connective between *vidhiḥ* and *yathāyuktāt*. I would sooner recur to the etymologic meaning of *vidhi*, 'disposal, putting apart,' and empha-

2. *prakṛtiḥ samhitāsvarūpam aneno 'cyate: prakṛtir vikramah kramah* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatvavidhānāt. yathāyuktāt yathāsthītāt padapāthāt kṛtasthād avicalito<sup>3</sup> yo vidhiḥ sā prakṛti-samhitā<sup>4</sup> vijñeyā: vidhir vidhānam prakṛtir ity arthah. yathā<sup>5</sup>: sva----- dhan----- sah----- pra----- jyā----- ā pā----- am-i----- atra sūtre padānam paraspārāṇvayo mahābhāshyavacandā<sup>6</sup> cā<sup>7</sup> vijñeyah: tac ca vacanaṁ tād varṇaprakṛtayaḥ* (ii.7) *ity atra pāthanti<sup>8</sup>: evam atrā<sup>9</sup> 'pi svaritayor madhye yatra nīcam* (xix.1) *ity addu mantavyam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *riñeyatvavidhāt*; B. *-tvena vi*; G. M. *jñeyatvena vi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-thāvas-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-caline*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. *-tiḥ s-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-canena*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>8</sup> O. G. M. *pāthitām*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *anyatrā*.

size its prefix *vi* sufficiently to make it take an ablative adjunct, meaning 'separation from [the state] as combined;' and I have so translated above, though far from being confident that I have found the true solution of the difficulty. Neither *vidhi* nor its synonym *vidhāna* occurs elsewhere in the text, although both are frequent in the commentary (see Index), usually with the meaning 'rule, prescription;' not infrequently also 'arrangement, disposal.'

The commentator concerns himself finally with the gender of *sā*, which, he says, comes under the rule already once quoted from the *Mahābhāshya* in explanation of a like case (under ii.7); and he points out further that the same principle applies elsewhere—for example, in xix.1.

### तत्र पूर्वपूर्वं प्रथमम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. And here, that which comes first is first taken.

That is to say, in the construction of the *samhitā* text, both the words to be treated and the rules to be applied must be taken up in their order, as they stand in the text and in the *Prātiçākhyā* respectively. A variety of instances are given to illustrate the working of the principle. First, in *bhāksha: ā: ihi* (iii.2.5<sup>1</sup>), the first two words are first combined, according to x.2, and then their result, *bhākshā*, is combined with *ihi*, by x.4, making *bhakshe* " 'hi, the true reading; whereas, if the second combination had been first made, forming *e* 'hi, this would have coalesced with *bhāksha* into *bhākshāi* 'hi—which (though in itself, as may well be claimed, the preferable reading) is unauthorized and incorrect. This exemplifies the application of the rule to the order in which words are to be treated; for its application to the use of rules there are three examples. The first concerns the production of the *samhitā*-reading *shannavatyāi* (vii.2.15) from the *pada*-reading *shatnavatyāi*: it is accomplished by the successive application of vii.2, which prescribes the conversion of *n* to *ṇ* after *shat*, and of viii.2,

3. *tatra samhitāvidhāne pūrvampūrvam padam sūtram ca prathamam kartavyam. yathā: bhāksha: ā: ihi: ity atra dīrghaṇ samānāksare* (x.2) *iti dīrghaḥ: <sup>1</sup> bhākshā: ihi: iti sthita ivarṇapara ekāram* (x.4) *ity ekāre kṛte bhakshe* " 'hi 'ti *bhavati: anyathāi* 'hi 'ti *kṛtvā bhākshaçabde* " *saṁdhiyamāne bhākshāi* 'hi 'ti *syāt: tac cā 'niṣṭam: pūrvapadakartavyatva etad udāharaṇam. pūrvasūtrakartavyatve* 'pi' *vaddmāḥ: yathā: shattriḡrāmanishpūrvāḥ* (vii.2) *iti nakārasya natve kṛta uttamapara uttamam savargīyam* (viii.2) *ity anena* " *takārasya natve kṛte* " *shannavatyā iti bhavati: anyathā* " *ttamapara uttamam* (viii.2) *iti sūtre prathamam* " *pravṛtte sati* " *shannavatyā iti syāt: tac cā 'niṣṭam. tathā: vaṭṭh<sup>10</sup> svayamabhi-gūrtāye* " *ty atra ṭanākārapūrvāç ca takārah* (v.33):



which changes *t* before *n* to *n*: if, on the contrary, the latter rule had been applied first, changing *shaṭ* to *shan*, the former would no longer have had force at all, and the reading would have stood *shannuvatyāi*. The next case is that in which the words *vat* and *svayamabhiḡārtāya* come together (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> seven times: G. M. read *vashaṭ* for *vat*, doubtless by a clerical error). Here, v.33 requires the insertion of a *t* between the *t* and *s*, and this inserted *t* is then, by xiv.12, made *th*; so that we are finally to read *vatth svay*: if the latter conversion were first made, the reading would turn out instead *vatth svay*- (since v.33 would not then apply at all, but to the combination *thsv* would be prefixed a *t* of duplication, by xiv.1.5: the manuscripts, as usual in such cases, do not give these complicated readings altogether correctly: and W. B. even make the blunder of substituting at last *vat svāhā*, apparently having in mind *-vāt svāhā*, in the same division). Once more, in the passage *imam vi syāmi* (ii.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), we are first to convert the *s* of *syāmi* to *sh* by vi.4, and then to duplicate the *sh* by xiv.1, making *vi shshyāmi*: if the duplication were first performed, making *vi ssyāmi*, then, by rule vi.4, we should have to read *vi shsyāmi*. Of the three examples thus given, only the first has to do with the form of the text as given in the manuscripts, since these very sensibly ignore the rules for duplication which make up the bulk of the fourteenth chapter of our treatise.

So far as regards the taking up of words for combination in their natural order, the Rik Pr. (ii.2) and Ath. Pr. (iii.38) have rules of like force with the present one.

## त्रपुमिथुपूर्वः शकारश्चपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. After *trapu* and *mithu* is inserted a *ç* before *c*.

*prathama āshmapuro dvitīyam* (xiv.12) *iti sūtradhvayam prasaktam: tatra pūrvatrāt tanakārapūrvāç ca takāra*<sup>11</sup> *ity etad eva prathamam kartavyam*<sup>12</sup>: *anyathā*<sup>13</sup> *vatth svayam iti*<sup>14</sup> *syāt: tac cā 'nishtam. athavā: imam vi shshyāmi*<sup>15</sup> *'ty atro 'pa-sarganishpūrvō 'nudātte pade* (vi.4): *svrapūrvam vy-añjanam*<sup>16</sup> *'dvivarnam vyañjanaparam*<sup>17</sup> (xiv.1) *iti sūtra-dhvayam*<sup>18</sup> *prāptam: tatra dvitvasūtre*<sup>19</sup> *prathamē kārye sati*<sup>20</sup> *vi shsyami*<sup>21</sup> *'ti syāt: tan nā bhād iti shatvam eva prathamam kartavyam.*

*pūrvampūrvam iti*<sup>22</sup> *vīpsā sarvathāi*<sup>23</sup> *'vam arthan samarthayati*<sup>24</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *tena*. <sup>2</sup> W. -*dena na*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> B. O. *sati*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. -*na*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *vashath*; B. *vata*; O. *vatt*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. om. <sup>12</sup> O. M. put before *prathamam*. <sup>13</sup> W. B. *vāt svāhe* *'ti*; O. *vāt svayam iti*; G. M. *vashath svayam iti*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. om. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -*trani*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *prathamam kṛte*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ins. *imam*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *shyāmi*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *vīpsā sarvathāi* *'tad āhāyam iti samarthaniyam*; B. *vīpsā sarvathāi* *'vam artha-* *yati*. <sup>20</sup> O. *sarvathāi*.

The passages are *sīsam ca me trapuṣ ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>), and *mīthuṣ carantam upayāti* (iv.7.15<sup>2</sup>): the existing *pada*-text reads *trapu* and *mīthu*, as this rule would lead us to expect. But the right of *trapuṣ* to be recognized as an independent word by the side of *trapu* is assured by the derivative adjective *trāpusha*, and the close analogy of *manu*, *manus*, *mānusha*.

The commentator adds a couple of counter-examples: one, *vi-bhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>1-2</sup>), to show that not every *u* has a *ṣ* added before *c*; the other, *asina mīthā kaḥ* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>), to show that the insertion is only made before *c*, after the words specified.

सुपूर्वश्च चन्द्रपरः ॥ ५ ॥

5. As also after *su*, before *candra*.

The example quoted by the commentator is *suṣcandra dasma viṣpate* (iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>): the word occurs once more, at ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>. The *pada*-text reads *su-candra*. Counter-examples are: *pra candra-mās tirati dirgham āyuk* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last two words), and *ā mā sucarite bhajā* (I.1.12): their application is obvious.

संपूर्वः सकारः कुरुपरः ॥ ६ ॥

6. After *sam* is inserted *s* before *kuru*.

The commentator's example is *yajamānaḥ saṅskurute* (v.6.6<sup>4</sup> and vi.5.5<sup>2</sup>). The *pada*-text reads *sam : kurute*. Counter-examples are *puroḍāgāḥ alaṁ kurv iti* (vi.3.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have a lacuna involving this passage), and *saṁkṛtya chādvākasāmum bhavati* (v.4.12<sup>3</sup>). The text has further *saṅskṛtya* and *saṅskṛta*, but (as is also implied in rule xvi.26) they are read in the *pada*-text as in *saṁhitā*, without division, or ejection of the intruded *s*.

अकुर्व च प्रत्ययात्परः ॥ ७ ॥

4. *trapuṣ*: *mīthu*: *evampūrvāḥ śakāra āgamo bhavati 'caparaḥ'*. *yathā*: *sīs-----: mīth----- evampūrvā iti kim: vi-----: evampara iti kim: as-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *cakārap*.

5. *cakāraḥ śakāram anvādiṣati*: *supūrvāḥ śakāra āgamo bhavati candraparaḥ*. *yathā*: *suṣ-----: evampūrvā iti kim: pra-----: evampara iti kim: ā mā-----: sv ity esha śabdaḥ pūrvō yasmād asāu supūrvāḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

6. *sam ity evampūrvāḥ śakāra āgamo bhavati kuruparaḥ*. *yathā*: *yaj-----: evampūrvā iti kim: 'pur-----: evampara iti kim?: saṁ-----: kuruśabdaḥ puro yasmād asāu kuruparaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. (2) G. M. om.

7. And before *akurva*, after the augment.

The passage is, as quoted by the commentator, *ta ishruṇ sam askurvata* (vi.2.3<sup>1</sup>); the *pada*-text reading *sam: akurvata*. The counter-example is *agnihotram vratham akurvata* (iii.2.2<sup>2</sup>). As *pratyaya* occurs nowhere else in the treatise we cannot tell whether it signifies distinctively 'augment,' or, as in other of the Prāti-ṣākhya, 'affix' in general. The commentator gives a scholastic explanation of the term, as indicating "that whereby the consonants are added unto, are made distinct."

## नीचापूर्वो दकार उच्चापरः ॥ ८ ॥

8. After *nīcā* is inserted *d* before *uccā*.

The passage is *madhyān nīcād uccā* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>); and the *pada*-text actually reads *nīcā: uccā*. This is a proceeding to which it would be hard to find a parallel in the *pada*-texts of the other Vedas. To write *madhyena* for *madhyāt* just before would be in itself quite as defensible. As counter-examples, we receive *lokaṁ yanty uccāvacā 'hni* (vii.4.3<sup>6</sup>), and *nīcā tam dhakshi* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

At the end of the comment is made the remark "the above are cases of insertion" (*āgama*, 'accession'). The matter of irregular conversions is next taken up.

## असंपूर्वो ऋमुकारः ॥ ९ ॥

9. After *asam*, *r* becomes *ar*.

The passage in which this anomalous change is made is *grhāṇām asamartyādi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>), where the *pada*-text has, as the rule implies, *asam-rtyādi*. Here, again, we cannot praise the work of the *pada*-text-maker. Nor is the rule of unexceptionable form, for the commentator is obliged to specify that the *asam* intended is one not made up of the parts of two words (not *-a sam*); else such passages as *kalyāṇī rūpasamṛddhā* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>), and *vahē hy esha*

7. *caḥārah sampārvaṭvam*<sup>1</sup> *āgamam*<sup>2</sup> *cā*<sup>3</sup> 'nvādiṣati. *akurva* 'ce 'ti' *grahane pratyayāt paraḥ sakāra āgamo bhavati sampārvaḥ. yathā: ta----- pratyayo nāmā 'kāra ucyate: pratyanta' abhivyañyante vyañjānāny anene 'ti pratyayaḥ. sampārva iti kim: agn-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*rvam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *sakārāg*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. *ca*; O. G. M. *iti*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *pratyāyante*; G. M. *pratyayante*.

8. *nīcāpūro dakāra āgamo bhavaty uccāparaḥ. yathā: madh----- evampārva iti kim: lok-----: evampara iti kim: nīcā-----*

*āgamā etc.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

*saṃrddhyāi* (ii.2.2<sup>1</sup>) would be included. As counter-example, to show that *r*, not a syllable containing *r*, is liable to the specified conversion, is quoted *asamtrñne hi hanū* (vi.2.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *hanū*).

अवग्रह आशीर्धूःसुवरिति रेफं परः सकारः षका-  
रम् ॥ १० ॥

10. Of *āçih*, *dhūh*, and *suvaḥ*, when first members of a compound, the *visarjanīya* becomes *r*, and a following *s* becomes *sh*.

The word *avagraha* in this rule is the locative *avagrahe*, says the commentator, and applies to each of the specified words taken separately. He supplies *visarjanīya*, the omission of which, or of some other word answering the same purpose, is rather a serious defect in the rule. The illustrative passages quoted are *ity āçir-padaya roā* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>; the *pada*-text reads *āçih-padayā*), *dhārshā-hāv anagrū* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>; p. *dhāh-sāhāv*), and *dadhishe suvarshām jih-vām agne* (iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *suvaḥ-sām*: W. B. O. omit the first word of the citation, G. M. the last). The necessity of the specification "when first members of a compound" is shown by the counter-example *ye devā devasuva sthā te* (i.8.10<sup>2</sup>: p. *deva-suvaḥ*: G. M. omit the first two words and the last). *Āçih* shows the same irregular combination also in *anāçirkena* and *sāçirkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>), but these words are not treated as divisible by the *pada*-text. The commentator goes on to point out the rules to which exceptions are established by this one: viii.23 would require *āçishpadayā*, and ix.2

9. *asam ity evampūrva ṛkāro 'ram vikāram āpadyate. yathā: grh----- tatra<sup>1</sup> nimittam ekapadasthām<sup>2</sup> vijñeyam: anyathā kaly-----: vahī-----: ity ādāv api bhavet. ṛkāra iti kim: asam-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *atra*. <sup>2</sup> B. -*dasamsthām*.

10. *avagraha iti saptamyantam padam āçihprabhṛtibhiḥ pratyekam abhisambadhyate. āçih: dhūh: suvaḥ: ity<sup>1</sup> eteṣhv avagraheshu visarjanīyo repham āpadyate: ebhyaḥ<sup>2</sup> paro yadi sa-kāro<sup>3</sup> vartate tarhi shakāram<sup>4</sup> āpadyate. yathā: ity-----: dhūr-----: dadh----- avagraha iti kim: ye----- kakhapakāra-parāḥ<sup>5</sup> (viii.23) ity anenā<sup>6</sup> "çishpadaye 'ti prāptam: 'aghoṣha-paras tasya sasthanam uśmānam<sup>7</sup> (ix.2) iti dhāssāhāv<sup>10</sup> suvaśām<sup>11</sup> iti ca prāptam<sup>8</sup>: tadubhayabhaṅgāyā 'yam ārambhāḥ. iticabda eśām evāi 'sha viçesho nā 'nyeshām iti prakāravāci.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tebh-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put before *yadi*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *so 'pi shatvam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. *parāḥ*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(8)</sup> W. om. <sup>9</sup> B. O. om. <sup>10</sup> B. O. *dhūhs-*. <sup>11</sup> B. O. *suvaḥs-*.

*dhāssāhu* and *suvaśām* (or, as it is customary to write them, *dhāssāhu* and *suvaśdm*: only G. M. are conscientious about giving the double sibilant, as demanded by the *Prātiçākhyā*). The *iti*, he remarks finally, signifies that only the words mentioned, and no others, are intended—that is to say, it has no particular meaning at all. It would be well if he always as frankly acknowledged the insignificance of this word where it occurs in the rules.

अथ लोपः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Now for cases of omission.

An introductory rule or heading, having force as far as rule 19, below, inclusive.

इपूर्वे मकारः ॥ १२ ॥

12. A *m* is dropped, when preceded by *im*.

The passage aimed at is *im 'andrá suprayasaḥ* (iv.1.8<sup>2</sup>: p. *im*: *mandrá*): it is the only one of its kind in the text. The *Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā* reads in the corresponding passage (xxvii.15) *im mandrá*. To treat the loss of a *m* here as suffered by the second word instead of the first is most arbitrary and unreasonable. The particle *im* is reduced to *i* in quite a number of *Rik* passages, and before other letters than *m*: they are duly noted in the *Prātiçākhyā* (*Rik* Pr. iv.36). A series of counter-examples is added by our commentator: *imam me varuṇa* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>) shows that *m* is not dropped after another *m* in general; *agnim mitram varunam* (ii.1.11<sup>1</sup>), that *m* after short *i* does not exercise the specified effect; *inkārāya svāhe 'inkrāya* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), that *im* elides no other consonant than *m*. The yet farther restriction is applied, that *im* here is a *padagrahana*, 'the citation of a complete *pada*;' for otherwise there would be an elision of a *m* in such cases as *prthivīm mā hiñsiḥ* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>): G. M. add the further example *uta gravaśa prthivīm mitrasya*, which I am unable to find in the *Sanhitā*.

तनुपूर्व उदात्तयोर्वकारः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: lopa ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmaḥ. ayam adhikāras tiṣṭhanty ekayā* (v.19) *itisūtraparyanto veditavyaḥ*.

12. *makāra im ity evampūrvo lupyate. yathā: im----- evampūrva iti kim: im am-----: dīrghena kim: agn----- im iti padagrahaṇam<sup>2</sup>: itarathā<sup>3</sup> prth----- ity ādāu makāro lupyeta<sup>4</sup>. makāra<sup>5</sup> iti kim: im-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. -hacarnaḥ. <sup>3</sup> G. M. anyathā. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -yate; and add *tac cā nishīdā*. <sup>5</sup> W. -rapara.

13. A *v* is dropped when preceded by *tu* or *nu*, in case these are accented.

It is when the particle *vāi*, or *vāva*, follows *tu* and *nu* that this anomalous mutilation is made. The commentator quotes *sa tv 'āi yajeta* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> and vii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: p. *saḥ: tu: vāi*), and *in nv 'ā upastīrnam ichanti* (i.6.7<sup>2</sup>: p. *it: nu: vāi*). The same *sandhi* of *tu* and *vāi* is not infrequent elsewhere (the passages are i.7.1<sup>4</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup>: ii.2.4<sup>8</sup>; 5.4<sup>1</sup>: iii.2.9<sup>2</sup>; 3.9<sup>2</sup>; 5.1<sup>3</sup>: v.5.9<sup>4</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>1</sup>: vii.2.10<sup>3</sup>); that of *nu* and *vāi* is comparatively rare (only at i.5.9<sup>6</sup> twice); that of *tu* and *vāva* I have found only once, at vii.5.6<sup>5</sup>. Here, again, it would seem better to regard the final *u* as suffering elision, instead of the initial *v*. The specification "if accented" is explained as intended to exclude such passages as *anu vrtrahatye* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>; 7.13<sup>1</sup>), where *anu* would fall under this rule by i.52 (even if the *nu* here, like the *im* in the preceding rule, were regarded as a *padagrahanam*). Other counter-examples, of obvious intent, are *idaṁ vām āsye haviḥ* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>), and *pra tu janayati 'ti* (i.7.2<sup>4</sup>) and *vidusho nu yajñam* (i.3.13<sup>1-2</sup>).

## उत्पूर्वः सकारो व्यञ्जनपरः ॥ १४ ॥

14. A *s* is dropped after *ut*, when a consonant follows.

The commentator's example is *praty uttabdhyāi sayatrāya* (vi.6.4<sup>6</sup>: p. *ut-stabdhyāi*). This is, so far as I have discovered, the only case in the *Sanhitā* from the root *stabh*: similar forms from *sthā* occur variously (*anātthāya*, iii.4.10<sup>3</sup>; *upotthāya*, vii.1.6<sup>3</sup>; 5.15<sup>1,2</sup>; *utthāsyant*, vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>; *utthīta*, vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>; 2.9<sup>3</sup>; and *utthāna*, vii.2.1<sup>4</sup> thrice). As counter-examples are given *jagatsthā devāḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *utkrañsyate svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>), and *utsādena jihvām* (v.7.11).

This familiar *sandhi* is also the subject of Ath. Pr. ii.18, and Vāj. Pr. iv.95.

## एषस्य इति च ॥ १५ ॥

15. Also *eshah*, *saḥ*, and *syah*.

13. *tu: nu': ity evampūrvo vakāro lupyate tayos tunvor udāt-tayoh sator iti vibhajya riyogo<sup>2</sup> vijñeyah. yathā: sa tv----- in nv----- udāttayor iti kim: anu----- apy akārādi (i.52) iti prāptih: evampūrva iti kim: 'idaṁ----- vakāra iti kim<sup>3</sup>: pra----- vid----- tuḥ ca nuḥ ca tunā<sup>4</sup>: tāu pūrvāu yasmāt sa ta-thoktah.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. *nā*, as also B. in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *vinīy*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *tunū*.

14. *vyañjanaparāḥ sakāra utpūrvo lupyate. yathā: praty----- vyāñjanam asmāt parāṇ iti vyāñjanaparāḥ. evampūrva iti kim: jag----- sakāra iti kim: ut----- evampara iti kim: ut-----*

Here the *ca*, 'also,' is declared to continue the implication of "when a consonant follows" from the preceding rule. The *iti* is added for the sake of clearness; it shows the final *visarjanīya* of *syah*, and attributes it by analogy to each of the other words also. What indicates that this final *visarjanīya* is the letter which is to suffer elision is not so evident. The illustrative examples are *esha te gāyatrāḥ* (iii.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *sa te jānāti* (i.2.14<sup>2-3</sup>; but G. M. substitute *sa tapo 'tapyata*, iii.1.1<sup>1</sup>), and *esha sya vāji* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>). The counter-example, showing that the omission occurs only before a consonant, is *dama evā 'syādi 'sha upa tishthate* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>), where, if the *h* of *eshaḥ* were lost by this rule, x.5 would require the reading *eshō 'pa*.

The corresponding rules in the other treatises are Rik Pr. ii.4, Vāj. Pr. iii.15,16, Ath. Pr. ii.57.

नासः ॥ १६ ॥

16. But not *asah*.

Namely, in the passage *hrtsvaso mayobhān* (iv.2.11<sup>5</sup>; p. *hrtsu-asah*), which would otherwise fall under the preceding rule for *sah*, by i.52.

इद्विदग्मन्मान्ननौषधीः परः सः ॥ १७ ॥

17. And *sah*, when followed by *id u*, *id agne*, *imān nah*, *enā*, *oshadhīh*.

These are the cases in the Sanhitā where, after the regular loss of the final of *sah*, its vowel is irregularly combined with the one that follows, against rule x.25. Such cases in the other Vedic texts are treated at Rik Pr. ii.33,34, and Vāj. Pr. iii.14. The commentator quotes the passages affected, as follows: *se 'd u hotā so adhvārān* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; B. O. omit the last word; G. M. the last two), *se 'd agne astu* (i.2.14<sup>3</sup>), *se 'mān no havryadātīm* (iv.6.6<sup>6</sup>), *sāi 'nā 'nīkena* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup> and 6.1<sup>5</sup>) and *sāu 'shadhīr anu rudhyase* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>, 11<sup>3</sup>). The first two need counter-examples, to show that *it* not followed by *u* or *agne* does not coalesce with *sa*: they are *sa ij*

15. *vyaktivishaya<sup>1</sup> itigabdhāḥ pratyekam esha ity ādīn<sup>2</sup> visarjanīyāntān<sup>3</sup> dyotayati: cakāro vyañjanaparātām anvādicati. eshaḥ: saḥ: syah: eshu<sup>4</sup> visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo lupyate. yathā<sup>5</sup>: esha-----: sa-----: esha-----: evampara iti kim: dama-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*tiṣṭha*; O. -*tiviṣṭha*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*nām*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*yāntatān*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *padeshu*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

16. *asa ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahane visarjanīyo vyañjanaparo na lupyate. hr̥t-----: apy akārādi* (i.52) *iti prāpter<sup>2</sup> nishedhah<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *elas*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*tiḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

janena (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>) and *sa id deveshu gachati* (iv.1.11<sup>1</sup>). The third also wants a counter-example, to prove the need of *naḥ* after *imām*: it is found in *sa imām abhy amṛṣat* (v.5.2<sup>4</sup>). Finally, to show that only *saḥ* undergoes the prescribed effect before the words specified in the rule, we have *paro divā para enā* (iv.6.2<sup>2</sup>).

## अवयक् इत्येकम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. Also *ity ekam*, when *ekam* is the former member of a compound.

The passage aimed at is *pāpīyānt syād ity ekāikaṁ tasya juhuyāt* (v.1.1<sup>2</sup>: but as given by W. O., without the first two words, it is also found again at v.4.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *juhuyāt*); and the *padā*-text actually reads *ekam-ekam*. The case is akin with that which forms the subject of the next rule. Two counter-examples are given, to justify the terms of the rule: they are *ardhukaṁ syād ity ekam agre tha* (vi.2.3<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words), and *yad ekamekaṁ sambharet* (i.6.8<sup>2</sup>).

## तिष्ठत्येकया सपूर्वः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Also *tishṭhanty ekayā*, along with the preceding letter.

The commentator quotes the passage: *tishṭhanty ekāikayā stutayā* (vii.5.8<sup>4</sup>); the *padā*-reading is *ekayā-ekayā*. As counter-example, where the same word remains unmutilated, is given *sumānānām karoty ekayāikayo 'tsargam* (vi.1.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first word).

In this rule and the foregoing are noted, but at the same time ignored, the first occurrences of the compound *ékāika*, which (see the St. Petersburg Lexicon) is not very rare in the Ṣatapatha Brāhmaṇa and later.

17. ----- <sup>1</sup> *evamparaḥ saḥkārā*<sup>2</sup> *ity atra visarjanīyo lupyate. yathā: se 'd----- se 'd----- v<sup>3</sup> agna ity ābhyan<sup>4</sup> kim: sa ----- sa----- se----- na iti kim: 'sa----- sūi----- sūu----- sa iti kim: paro-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *sakāra*; G. M. *sa*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. *id*; G. M. O. *u*. <sup>4</sup> B. O. *etābhyām*. <sup>5</sup> A. *lacuna* in B., to near the end of the comment on rule 18.

18. *itiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa ekam ity asminn avagrahe makāro lupyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: pāp----- avagraha iti kim: ardh-----: itiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa iti kim:<sup>2</sup> ya d-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> End of the *lacuna* in B.

19. *tishṭhantiṣabḍaviṣiṣṭa ekaye 'ty asmin grahane 'ntyo<sup>1</sup> varṇaḥ sapūrvāḥ pūrvasahito lupyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: tish----- tishṭhanti<sup>3</sup> 'ti kim: sam----- pūrvēna saha vartata iti sapūrvāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*yasvaro*. <sup>2</sup> O. om.



The terms in which the rule is expressed show that, from rule 15 on, the implication has been of a "final" letter as liable to the effect prescribed. We have reason to be surprised that it was not distinctly stated when first made.

नकारः शकारं चपरः ॥ २० ॥

20. A *n*, when followed by *c*, becomes *ç*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are *ahīṅ ca sarvāṁ jambhayan* (iv.5.1<sup>2</sup>), *ṛtāṅ ca tasya nakshatriyām ca* (vii.1.3<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *ca*), and *karnāṅ ca 'karnāṅ ca* (i.8.9<sup>3</sup>). The counter-examples, to show that only *n* is so changed, and *n* itself only before *c*, not before other palatal mutes, are *çam ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>) and *tān chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit *anu*).

The nature of the conversion taught in this rule, and of the kindred ones forming the subject of rules vi.14 and ix.20, as being a historical, not a euphonic process, has been sufficiently explained and illustrated in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.26. At the same place will be found noted the usage of the other Vedic texts as regards the *sandhi ṅc*: the Atharvan and the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā make it uniformly, the Rik only occasionally. In the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā it is prevailingly usual: I have noted thirty-nine examples of it, against the eight exceptions mentioned in the next rule.

The definition of the *sandhi*, of course, is not complete without the aid of rules xv.1-3, which teach that, where *n* has been converted into a sibilant, the preceding vowel is nasalized, or has *anusvāra* added to it. A better course, according to our understanding of the history of the phenomenon, would be to teach the insertion of a *s* (or *visarjanīya*) and the change of *n* to *anusvāra* before it: but the makers of the Prātiçākhyas concern themselves much less about the theoretical accuracy than the mechanical aptitude of their rules.

नायन्नैर्यन्त्रावृत्तनडांघृणीवान्वारुणानेवास्मिन् ॥ २१ ॥

21. But not the *n* of *āyan*, *āirayan*, *ārdhnuvan*, *anaḍvān*, *ghṛṇvān*, *vārunān*, and *evā'smin*.

The passages are: *lokam āyaṁ cutasrah* (v.2.3<sup>4</sup>), *yām āirayan*

20. *cakāraparo*<sup>1</sup> *nakārah çakāram āpadyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *ah-----*  
*ṛt-----* *kar-----* *nakāra iti kim: çam-----* *capara iti kim:*  
*tān-----* *cah*<sup>3</sup> *puro yasmād asdu caparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *caparo*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *cakirah*.

21. ----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *grahaṇeshu nakārah çakāram nā*<sup>2</sup> *padyate*  
*caparo 'pi. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *lo-----* *yām-----* *loka-----* *anaḍ-----*  
*ghṛṇ-----* *vār-----* *evā-----* *'eti kim:*<sup>3</sup> *asm-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> B. om.

*candramasi* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *loka ārdhnuvan caruṇā 'smiṇ* (v.5.1<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), *anaḍvān ca me dhenuḥ ca me* (iv.7.10<sup>2</sup>), *ghṛnāvān cetati tmanā* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), *vārunān catushkapālān nīr vapet* (ii.3.12<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the last two words), and *evā 'smiṇ cakshur-dhattah* (ii.2.9<sup>3-4</sup>; 3.8<sup>2</sup>). *Evā 'smiṇ* is found once more, in a slightly different connection, at ii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: the others occur only in the passages cited. A counter-example, *asmiñc cā 'mushmiñc ca* (vii.3.4<sup>1,5,2</sup>) is given to prove the need of specifying *eva* before *asmin*.

By rule 24, below, the *n* in all these cases is assimilated to the *c*, and should be so written in the text. My own manuscript of the *Sanhitā*, in fact, follows the authority of the *Prātiśākhya*, and represents the assimilated nasal in the same manner as an assimilated *m*, except in a single case (*ārdhnuvan car-*). The Calcutta edition, however, in the part hitherto published, gives *ñ c* only once (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), and everywhere else *n c*.

## तकारश्चकारश्च शचक्षपरः ॥ २२ ॥

22. A *t*, when followed by *ç*, *c*, or *ch*, becomes *c*.

The form assumed by initial *ç* after this assimilation is taught in rules 34-37, below.

The commentator's examples are: *tac chamyoḥ* (ii.6.10<sup>2,2-3</sup>), *tac cā 'daduḥ* (vii.1.5<sup>3</sup>), and *tac chandasān chandastvam* (v.6.6<sup>1</sup>). He proceeds to point out that the *ç*, *c*, and *ch*, all mentioned in the rule as upon the same footing, are to be understood as original (not the products of previous euphonic processes), that being their chief or primary value: otherwise the mention of *ç* at all would be superfluous; since, the *ç* being (by v.34) ordered changed to *ch* after a mute, it would be enough for this rule to say "when followed by *c* or *ch*." Moreover, if the later rule were applied, then, after it, the application of the earlier rule would not be suitable (*svarasa*, 'having its own proper flavor;' the word is not used elsewhere), as it would constitute an offense against the third rule of this chapter.

22. *çacachaparas takāraç cakāram āpadyate. yāthā: tac-----: tac-----: tac----- atra çacachapara iti sāmānyoktānām<sup>1</sup> nimitānām<sup>2</sup> prakṛtitvam<sup>3</sup> vijñeyam: mukhyatvāt: tatra<sup>4</sup> prakṛta-vāikṛtayoḥ prakṛtam<sup>5</sup> mukhyam: anyathā çakāragrahaṇavādyarthyāt<sup>6</sup>: kuto vādyarthiyam: sparçapūrvah çakāraç çakāram (v.34) iti çakārasya chatve kṛte takāraç cakāram çacachapara<sup>7</sup> ity etāvātādi<sup>8</sup> 'va siddher<sup>9</sup> iti brūmah. kim ca: parasūtre pravṛtte sati paçcāt pūrvasūtraprasaraṇam na svarasam<sup>10</sup>: tatra pūrvavampūrvam prathamam (v.3) iti niyamabhaṅgaprasaṅgāt<sup>10</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. B. O. -nyeno 'kt. <sup>2</sup> W. O. prānī-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. prakṛtatv-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -tatvam. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -yāc ca. <sup>7</sup> G. M. B. çacacha-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. siddhir. <sup>9</sup> G. M. bhavati. <sup>10</sup> G. M. nyāyabh-.

## तपरो जकारम् ॥ २३ ॥

23. When followed by *j*, it becomes *j*.

The cited example is *taj jayānām jayātavam* (iii.4.4): rather superfluously, a counter-example is also given: *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नकार एतेषु जकारम् ॥ २४ ॥

24. A *n*, before the same letters, becomes *ñ*.

As *eteshu* is plural, we are obliged, having recourse to that which lies nearest, to regard as implied the letters pointed out in the last two rules as requiring certain changes in those that precede them: that is to say, *ç*, *c*, *ch*, *j*. These are, in fact, the whole class of palatals, since *ñ* never occurs at the beginning of a word, nor, indeed, in any independent position, and since *jñ* is found nowhere in any Vedic text. The dental *n*, then, never maintains itself before a palatal, but is assimilated to it. The other treatises teach virtually the same doctrine: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.11.

The commentator's illustrative example for *n* before *ç* (where, to complete the combination, rule 34 below has also to be applied) is *tendī 'vāi 'nāñ chamayati* (iii.4.8<sup>4</sup>). As for *n* before *c*, he points out that the rule applies only to the cases where the *n* does not become *ç* by v.20, as excepted by v.21, and quotes again one of the examples given under the latter rule, *lokam āyañ catasrah* (v.2.3<sup>4</sup>). Before *ch*, he gives the phrase already quoted as counter-example under v.20, *tāñ chandobhir anu* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup>); and before *j*, *aparāpam ātmañ jāyate* (iii.5.7<sup>3</sup>). As general counter-example, finally, he gives *tānt subdhān* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>), where *n*, coming before *s*, is treated in a quite different manner.

The occurrence of *n* before *ch*, which does not once happen in the Atharvan, is found not less than nine times in the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā. My own MS. reads every time *nch*, combining the dental nasal with the palatal aspirate. The Calcutta edition, at the only place which it contains as yet, reads *ñch*.

23. *sāmniḍhyāt takāra iti labhyate: japaras takāro jakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: taj----- evampara iti kim: tat-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

24. *eteshu iti bahuvacananirdeṣāt<sup>1</sup> pratyāsannam evā 'napekshya<sup>2</sup> sūtradvayastheshu paranimitteshu sampratyayaḥ<sup>3</sup>: tasmād eteshu iti: çacachajeshu<sup>4</sup> parata<sup>5</sup> ity arthaḥ: nakāro ñakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>6</sup>: te-----: çatvāpattān nishiddho<sup>7</sup> yo nakārah so 'tru aparatvena viśayīkriyate. lok-----: tāñ-----: apa----- evampara iti kim: tānt-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. -*rdiç*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. 'napek-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *praty*-. <sup>4</sup> W. O. -*chabhujeshu*. <sup>5</sup> W. *para*; G. M. *pareshu*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. B. O. put after *yo*.

The combination of final *n* with initial *ç*, producing, according to all the phonetic text-books (with trifling exceptions: see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17), *ñch*, is decidedly of more common occurrence. But here, too, my own MS. reads, with but a single exception among the cases which I have noted, *nch*: the Calcutta text is inconsistent with itself, now giving *ñ* (as at ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>), now *n* (as at i.3.9<sup>1</sup>).

Final *n* is found yet more frequently before initial *j*, or some scores of times in all. As regards its method of writing the combination, my manuscript is about equally divided between *nj* and *ñj*. The Calcutta text is equally wavering; and there is no approach to consistency between the two authorities, or to recognizable principle in either: in both alike, the variation seems wholly accidental and arbitrary.

Such being the case, I think it clear that a careful editor of the *Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā* ought to disregard, as of no authority or consequence, the variations, or the unanimity, of his manuscripts upon all these points, and to adopt uniformly the reading prescribed by the *Prātiçākhyā* (either *ñ* or *n*), wherever a final *n* comes to stand before a palatal mute.

## तपरी लकारम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Both *t* and *n*, when followed by *l*, become *l*.

The dual *laparāu* indicates that the *t* and *n*, already treated of, are the letters aimed at in this rule, says the commentator. He cites as examples *yal lohitaṁ parāpatat* (ii.1.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), and *trīṇ lokān ud ājayat* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *ud ājayat*). The combination of *n* and *l* is finished by the next rule, and will be further remarked upon in the note thereto.

## नकारो ऽनुनासिकम् ॥ २६ ॥

26. The *n* becomes nasalized *l*.

As the nasal quality of *n* itself is already established by rule ii.30, explains the commentator, it could not properly be defined here again as nasal. Hence the *anunāsikam* of the present precept must be understood as qualifying the *l* of like position into which the *n* is converted: this *l* is to be a nasal *l*. No additional example is given, the combination having been illustrated under the preceding rule.

There are in the *Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā* over a hundred cases of the meeting of final *n* with initial *l*, and in fully two-thirds of them

25. *dvivacanasāmarthyād<sup>1</sup> grhītāu prakṛtāu<sup>2</sup> takāranakārāu lakāram āpadyete<sup>3</sup> laparāu. vathā<sup>4</sup>: yal..... trīṇ..... lak<sup>5</sup> paro yābhyām tāu laparāu.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*itya*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> MSS. -*yate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *lakārah*.

my MS. reads *nl* simply, without attempting any accommodation of the two sounds to one another. In the remaining cases, it treats the *n* in the same way as it would treat a *m*, substituting for it the ordinary *anusvāra*-dot over the preceding *akshara*. The Calcutta text varies between *nl* and *ñll*. Here, as in the cases treated above, there seems to be every reason why an editor should follow one consistent method, as the irregularities of the manuscripts have no ground but accident—and, not less certainly, the method prescribed by the *Prātiśākhya* is the one better entitled to be followed. As to the way in which the nasal *l* shall be represented, there may be some question. As I have already mentioned (note to ii.30), I cannot think that the designation of the Calcutta edition is at all to be commended, since it properly implies the insertion of an *anusvāra* between the preceding vowel and a doubled *l*, and thus quite distorts the character of the combination—except as this is viewed by *Ātreya*, as noted in a later rule (v.31). The method followed in my MS., on the other hand, is theoretically unobjectionable, since there is no phonetic difference recognized, or to be recognized, by phonetic theory between the combination of *n* and *l* and that of *m* and *l*: it has only the practical inconvenience of not distinguishing to the eye these two combinations—and this is of very small account, since there can be few if any cases where the least ambiguity would result. If the nasal *l* is to be written separately, it should properly have the *virāma* beneath and the sign of nasality over it. That is to say, one ought always to print either अस्मिन् लोके or अस्मिं लोके, not अस्मिँल्लोके.

In romanized text, as the assimilated *m* is represented by *m̐*, so, by an analogous method and for the sake of convenient distinction, the assimilated *n* may be very suitably represented by *n̐*; and this is the sign with which I have chosen to write it, both before *l* and before the palatals.

All the *Prātiśākhyas* (see note to *Ath. Pr.* ii.35) agree in converting both *n* and *m* before *l* into a nasal *l*.

## मकार स्पर्शपरस्तस्य सस्थानमनुनासिकम् ॥ २७ ॥

27. A *m*, when followed by a mute, becomes the nasal of like position with it.

The commentator's examples are *yam kāmāyeta* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.), *gam ca me* (iv.7.3<sup>1</sup>), *taṁ te duṣṭakṣhāḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *tam prat-*

26. *anusvārottamā' anundāsikāḥ* (ii.30) *iti nakārasyaḍ' nu-  
nāsikatve siddhe' punar atrā' pi tatkāthanam anupapannam:  
tasmād atra lakṣaṇayāḍ nakāro nāma tatsthāno lakāra' ity ar-  
thah: asāv' anundāsikam bhajate'. pūrvoktam evo' dāharaṇam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *nanu anundāsvāḍ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *'pi*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *nak*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *lakāro*.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *bhajeta*.

*nathā* (i.4.9). Of *m* before a lingual he is able to give no example, as such a concurrence is not to be found in the *Sanhitā*.

अन्तस्थापरश्च सवर्णमनुनासिकम् ॥ २८ ॥

28. Followed by a semivowel, it becomes a nasal of like quality with it.

From the class of semi-vowels is excepted *r*, by the next rule. Examples are given for the others, as follows: *saṃyattā āsan* (i.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *svargam lokam* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup> et al.), *saṃvatsaraḥ* (i.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.: the *pada*-text, like that of the Atharvan, reads *saṃ-vat-saraḥ*, while that of the Rik leaves the word undivided). No attempt is made in the manuscripts or the printed text of the *Sanhitā* to give a special representation to these nasal semi-vowels standing for an assimilated *m*: it is left to be understood that the sign of nasality over the preceding *akṣhara* stands for a nasal letter of like quality with the following consonant in the case of the semi-vowels, just as in that of the mutes, provided for by the preceding rule. Nor are the manuscripts of the *Prātiçākhyā* and its commentary any more particular—saving that G. M. usually write, instead of *my*, the combination *yy*, without any sign of the nasality of the first *y*.

Only the Ath. Pr. disagrees with our treatise in its treatment of *m* before the semi-vowels, acknowledging no nasal *y* or *v*, but a *l* alone (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.35).

The commentator explains the word *anunāsika*, 'nasal,' in the rule, by *anunāsikadharmaviçishṭa*, 'distinguished by nasal quality,' but afterward raises a difficulty over it, in terms which imply that he regards it as a noun, 'a nasal;' asking, how we are to understand it here as equivalent to *sānunāsika*, 'combined with nasality.' As it is, in fact, originally and properly an adjective, signifying 'possessed of nasal quality,' and is constant-

27. *sparçaparo makāras tasya sparçasya sasthanam anunāsikam<sup>1</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: yañ-----: çañ-----: tañ-----: tam-----.*  
*samānam sthānam yasyā<sup>3</sup> sāu sasthanāḥ: tam<sup>3</sup>: sparçañ paro*  
*yasmād asū sparçaparaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. om.

28. *cakāro makāram anvādiçati: antasthāparo makāras tasyā antasthāyāḥ savarnam sadṛgam anunāsikam<sup>1</sup> anunāsikadharmaviçishṭam bhajate. yathā: sañ-----: suv-----: sañ-----.*  
*nanv anunāsikam ity anena sānunāsikam<sup>2</sup> katham labhyate<sup>3</sup>.*  
*ucyate: nitarām parihārah<sup>3</sup>: yato dharmavācakaḥ çabdo dharminam<sup>4</sup> api<sup>5</sup> kathayati: çuklaḥ paṭo nīlam utpalam ity ādivat<sup>7</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> W. om.; O. *ity anena sānunāsikam katham upalambhāmahe*; G. M. *saklam upalambhāmahe yathā*. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> W. *dharmena*. <sup>5</sup> W. *avika*; O. *avi*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *yathā*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *ādi*.

ly so used and applied in the Prâtiçâkhyâ, the difficulty is worse than hair-splitting; it is a downright perversion. The answer by which it is met is a quibble worthy of being matched with it: "because a word expressing a quality also designates the object possessing that quality; as, for example, when we say 'a white cloth,' 'a blue lotus.'" As if the words "white" and "blue" strictly applied to the color alone, and did not just as properly mean 'of white color,' 'of blue color'!

न रेफपरः ॥ २९ ॥

29. But not when followed by *r*.

*R* being also a semi-vowel, *m* would be converted into a corresponding nasal before it by the previous rule, but for this special exception. The instances given of the treatment of *m* before *r* are *pra samrâjam prathamam adhvarânâm* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have only the first two words), and *sâmrañjyâya sukratuh* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup>). They are particularly ill selected, as neither case comes under the action of the preceding rule; they fall, rather, under xiii.4, and are, in fact, the two passages there given as examples of the peculiar treatment of *sam* before *râj*. We ought to have, instead, such passages as *pratyushtañ rakshañ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup>), *vi vayan ruhema* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>)—which, of course, are of exceedingly frequent occurrence in the Sanhitâ.

The omission of *m* before *r*, and the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or the insertion of *anusvâra* after the latter, are taught below, in rules xiii.2,xv.1–3. The written and printed texts are consistent in their recognition of the mode of combination thus prescribed, always setting the proper *anusvâra* sign before *r*, while before *y*, *l*, *v* they write the assimilated *m* just as before the mutes.

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३० ॥

30. Nor, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

The authorities referred to, of course, would leave the *m* to be treated before these letters as before *r*, and would acknowledge no

29. *antasthâtâvâd rephaparasyâ<sup>1</sup> 'pi makârâsya tatsavarṇânunâsikaprâptir<sup>2</sup> anena nishidhyate: na khalu rephaparo<sup>3</sup> makârâh pûrveoktam bhajate. yathâ<sup>4</sup>: pra-----: sâm----- rephah paro yasmâd ashu rephaparah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *rephasya tatp.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-kâpattiḥ prâptâ.* <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-pakâro.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

30. *cakâro nishedhânâvâdeçakah<sup>1</sup>: prakṛto<sup>2</sup> makâra ekeshâm âdriyânâm pakṣe yakâraparo vâ<sup>3</sup> vakâraparo<sup>4</sup> vâ na savarṇam anundâsikam bhajate. yathâ<sup>5</sup>: sañ- : sañ-.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-âkarshakah.* <sup>2</sup> W. B. *prâk.* <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om.

nasal semi-vowel save *l*. Their opinion is again quoted in connection with the rule respecting the actual treatment of *m* before *r* (xiii.3), and the commentator there calls attention to the fact that the "some teachers" spoken of are the same with those here noticed: who they are, he does not attempt to tell us. The view held by them is the same with that taken by the Atharva Prāṭiśākhya, as pointed out above (see Ath. Pr. ii.35, and the note upon it); but, until we know much more than we do at present of the history and mutual relations of these phonetic treatises, it would be highly venturesome to conclude that the authors of this Prāṭiśākhya had here in mind the other one and its authors.

I find it difficult to discover any good phonetic reason why the assimilation of *m* should not yield a like result before all the semi-vowels, and why, if we are to admit an *anusvāra* at all, it would not find a particularly appropriate place as representing the sound into which *m* might naturally pass before *y*, *r*, *l*, and *v*.

As examples, are repeated *saṁvatsaraḥ* and *saṁyuttāḥ* (see under rule 28, above).

### उत्तमलभावात्पूर्वी ञ्नुनासिक इत्यात्रियः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Ātreya holds that, when a nasal mute becomes *l*, the previous vowel is nasalized.

As has been pointed out above, Ātreya's view of the combination is the one represented accurately by the mode of writing adopted in the Calcutta edition. It is not elsewhere supported in the Prāṭiśākhyas. Its quotation here seems a little unprepared, or the expression of it given in the rule imperfect, as we have been directed to convert *m* and *n*, not into *l*, but into a nasal *l*. One might think, too, that it would be in better place at the beginning of chapter xv., where certain other differences of opinion on kindred points are rehearsed.

The commentator gives Ātreya the title of *muni*, 'sage,' instead of *ācārya*, 'teacher.'

To illustrate the sage's style of making the combination, he cites *trīṇ lokān* (i.7.11<sup>1</sup>) and *svargaṇi lokam* (i.5.4<sup>4</sup> et al.); but not one of the manuscripts of the commentary takes the pains to write the extracts as they should be written, to serve their purpose as illustrations. Finally, he adds the caution that "this rule and the preceding are not approved."

### उपूर्वः ककारः सषकारपरः ॥ ३२ ॥

31. *uttamasya nakārasya makārasya' vā labhāvāl lakārāpatteḥ pārvasvaro 'nundāsiko bhavati 'ty ātreya nāma munir manyate. yathā': trīṇ-----: sv-----: uttamayor labhāva uttamalabhāvah': tasmāt.*

*sūtradvāyam etad anisṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. put before *nak*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.



32. After *ñ* is inserted a *k* before *s* and *sh*.

The commentator's examples are *pratyāñk somo atidrutah* (i.8.21: but G. M. have instead *sadrñk samānāñh*, ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>), and *pratyāñk shadaho bhavati* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: O. G. M. omit *bhavati*). As counter-examples, showing that the insertion is made only under the circumstances specified, he gives *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>), and *tat savituh* (i.5.8<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *tat shodaṣi* (vi.6.11<sup>1</sup>).

The combinations here treated of are not otherwise than rare in any Vedic text. In the *Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā* I have found no other instance of the meeting of *ñ* and *sh* than the one quoted; of *ñ* before *s*, besides the two here given, occur two others, at vi.3.1<sup>5</sup> and iv.4.4<sup>7-8</sup>; but, in the latter passage, the division of the section into half-centuries falls between the two letters, as the text is at present written, and prevents the exhibition of the *sandhi*. Neither the Calcutta edition (so far as yet printed) nor my manuscript makes in any of these passages the insertion required by the *Prātiśākhya*: and it may properly enough be considered a question whether the latter's authority ought to be followed in a matter of this character, any more than in regard to the duplications which form the subject of chapter xiv. Nevertheless, considering the phonetic reasonableness of this particular insertion, and its close analogy with that of *t* between *n* and *s* (see the next rule), I should myself decidedly incline to write *ñk s* and *ñk sh*. The manuscripts of the commentary, it should be remarked, try to follow the directions of the rule, W. B. O. reading *ñks*, and W. O. *ñksh* (with the *k* and *sh* united in the usual sign for *ksh*); while G. M. even yield to the requirement of xiv.12, and give us *ñkhs* and *ñkshsh*. This last is a refinement which no one, probably, would care to see introduced into our printed texts.

As is shown in detail in the note to Ath. Pr. ii.9, the teachings of the Ath. Pr. and Vāj. Pr. are virtually in agreement with those of our own treatise as regards the insertions prescribed in this rule and the next, while the Rik Pr. merely mentions them as enjoined by some authorities.

## टनकारपूर्वश्च तकारः ॥ ३३ ॥

33. After *t* or *n* is inserted a *t*.

The examples given for these combinations are *vashatt svāhā* (vii.3.12 nine times), and *vidvānt somēna yajate* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>); and, in order not to be without an illustration for the collision of *t* with *sh*, one is dragged in from the *jātā*-text: *anvājānu shatt shad anvājānu anvājānu shat* (vi.6.3<sup>3</sup>): to which G. M. even add, from the

---

32. *sakraparah<sup>1</sup> shakraparo vā kakāra āgamo bhavati nāpūrvah. yathā: praty-----: praty----- evampara iti kim: praty-----: evamparva iti kim: tat-----: tat-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *vā*.

same source, *tānt subdhānt subdhāñs tāñs tānt subdhān* (ii.4.1<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples are *śhaḍ vā ṛtavuḥ* (iii.4.8<sup>6</sup>), and *tān rudrā abruvan* (v.5.2<sup>6</sup>).

The final lingual *ṭ* occurs before *s*, according to my notes upon the text, in ten other passages (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> eight times: iv.4.8<sup>1</sup>; 6.1<sup>4</sup>: v.4.3<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>; 5.2<sup>6</sup>: vi.2.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.3<sup>3</sup>: vii.1.5<sup>1</sup>; 4.10<sup>2</sup>); and my MS. does not once employ the intermediate *ṭ*. The manuscripts of our commentary, however, all introduce it; and this time B. abets G. M. in converting it into *th*, by rule xi.12. The combination is without doubt a very troublesome one, in the demand it makes upon the tip of the tongue: but whether the transition is helped by the intrusion of a *ṭ* is a much more serious question—and one to exercise and gratify the subtlety of a Hindu phonetist. The Ath. Pr. also requires *ṭs* (ii.8), but the Rik Pr. (iv.6) only notices the mode of *sandhi* as enjoined by certain teachers.

It is indeed true that the strict letter of the rule requires a *ṭ* to be inserted between a *ṭ* and *śh*, as illustrated by the commentator from the *jaṭā*-text. But it would be wholly preposterous to suppose that the authors of the Prāṭicākhya intended to teach any such insertion—which would convert the consonant combination from one wholly natural and easy to one in a high degree harsh and difficult, if not absolutely impossible. They evidently relied on the non-occurrence of *śh* after *ṭ* anywhere in the Sanhitā for the annulling of that part of the rule's prescription—either having no regard to a *jaṭā*-text, or overlooking the fact that in it the two letters would come in contact.

Twice in the Tāittirīya text we have a final *ṭ* before an initial *śh* (at v.5.2<sup>6</sup>: vii.5.6<sup>3</sup>). Although their collision might seem to call for mediation in somewhat the same manner as that of *ṭ* and *s*, the Prāṭicākhya makes no special provision for it, and the manuscript text simply combines the two letters.

The meeting of final *n* with initial *s*, the other case contemplated by the rule, is very frequent (there are sixty instances in the first two *kāṇḍas*: I have not collected them through the whole text). Neither the printed text nor my manuscript is absolutely faithful in inserting the prescribed *ṭ*; yet I have found but six cases in the whole Sanhitā in which the latter omits it; and out of the seven passages in *kāṇḍas* i. and ii. where the former leaves it out, my manuscript confirms the omission in only one. As the requirement of the Prāṭicākhya receives so much support from the usage of the scribes, and also accords with the prescriptions of the Ath. Pr. (ii.9) and Vāj. Pr. (iv.14), there can be no question that it ought to be followed by an editor of the Tāittirīya Veda.

---

33. *cakārah sashakārāv anvāḍigati: takārapūrvo vā<sup>1</sup> nakārapūrvo vā takāra āgamo bhavati sashakāraparah. vash-----: vid-----: anā-----: tānt----- evampara iti kim: śhaḍ-----: tān-----.*

<sup>1</sup> B. om.

## स्पर्शपूर्वः शकारश्चकारम् ॥ ३४ ॥

34. A *ç* preceded by a mute becomes *ch*.

The commentator gives only an example of a *ç* converted into *ch* after *t*, the *t* at the same time becoming *c* by rule 22, above: *çarac chrāutrī* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>). He adds a counter-example, *āçuḥ çicānaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>). The occurrence of any other final mute than *t* and *n* (for which an example is given above, under rule 24) before initial *ç* is very rare (excepting *m*, for which see the following rule); and it is properly only after a dental, or after a dental or lingual, that the conversion here prescribed has good phonetic ground—namely, in the coalescence of a *t*-sound and a *sh*-sound into the compound sound of our *ch* in *church* (see note to Ath. Pr. ii.17). There is one case of a preceding *t* (i.3.14<sup>6</sup>), where my MS. reads, as the Prātiçākhyā directs, *t ch*, while the Calcutta text has *t ç*. A single case of preceding *p* is treated of below, in rule 36.

## न मकारपूर्वः ॥ ३५ ॥

35. But not when preceded by *m*.

By this rule, says the commentator, is annulled the conversion of *ç* to *ch* after *m*, which would otherwise be in order (according to the preceding rule), since *m* is a mute. He instances *sañçitam me* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup> and v.1.10<sup>2</sup>) and *sañçravā ha* (i.7.2<sup>1</sup>). Being thus specially exempted from the operation of the foregoing rule, this combination, of course, falls under xiii.2 and xv.1-3, and the *m*, as before other spirants, becomes *anusvāra*. An objection is raised against the pertinence of the present precept, on the ground that xiii.2 directs the omission of *m* before a spirant, and that hence there could arise no occasion for any such conversion of *ç* into *ch* as is here contemplated and guarded against. The reply, however, is a very easy one; that, by rule 3 of this chapter, the requirement of the conversion into *ch*, as it is stated earlier, would have to be applied first, and that the result of so doing would be to pro-

34. *çakāraç çakāram āpadyate sparçapūrvāḥ*<sup>1</sup>. *yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *çarac*..... *evampūrva iti kim*: *āçuḥ*..... *sparçāḥ pūrvo yas-mād asāu sparçapūrvāḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. puts first. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. om.

35. *makārapūrvāḥ çakāraç çakāram nā* <sup>2</sup>*pādyate*. *yathā*: *sañ*.....: *sañ*..... *sparçatvān makārasya* <sup>1</sup>*tatpūrve* <sup>2</sup>*çakāre* <sup>3</sup>*prāptam chatvam* <sup>4</sup>*anena nishidhyate*. *nanv etad anupapannam*: <sup>5</sup>*atha makāralopaḥ* (xiii.1): *rephoshmaparaḥ* (xiii.2) *iti makārasya lopavidhānān na* <sup>6</sup>*çakārasya chatvāpattinimittam* <sup>7</sup>*astī* <sup>8</sup>*ti*. *māi* <sup>9</sup>*vam*: <sup>10</sup>*chatvāpādakam malopāpādakāt pūrvam*: <sup>11</sup>*atas* <sup>12</sup>*tatra pūrvampūrvam prathamam* (v.3) *iti nyā-*

duce, in the passage already quoted, the reading *saṁchitam me brahma*; which is wrong.

पकारपूर्वश्च वाल्मीकिः ॥ ३६ ॥

36. Nor, according to Vālmiki, when preceded by *p*.

There is but a single case in the Sanhitā of *p* before *ṣ*, namely the one here quoted by the commentator, *anushtup chāradī* (iv.3.2<sup>2</sup>): so my manuscript reads, according to the requirement of rule 34, above. Vālmiki thinks it would be better to read *anushtup chāradī*—and I presume we shall have little hesitation in approving his opinion.

व्यञ्जनपरः पौष्करसादेर्न पूर्वश्च जकारम् ॥ ३७ ॥

37. Nor, according to Pāushkarasādi, when followed by a consonant; and a preceding *n*, in that case, does not become *ñ*.

This translation is made in accordance with the commentator's exposition. One might be tempted to understand the last part of the rule otherwise, not regarding the continuance of the negative as implied from the other part; translating 'and a preceding *n* becomes *ñ*;' but, besides the authority of the comment against it, this would be a mere repetitious enactment of the rule already given above (v.24). The inquiry is raised, how we know that *pūrvah*, 'the preceding letter,' means here 'a preceding *n*.' The reply is, because only *n* is liable to conversion into *ñ*, and annulment is only made of that which would, without direction to the contrary, be liable to take place.

The examples given to illustrate this peculiar view of Pāushkarasādi are *ādityān smaṣrubhiḥ* (v.7.12), and *pāpīyān greyase* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>). The edition has *pāpīyān chreyase* in the latter passage, in accordance with the approved rules of the Prâtigākhya; but my MS. seems to have been written by a sectary of Pāushkarasādi at this point (namely, in the margin: a line or two of the context was omitted just here by the original scribe). In the former, I

*yena chatvam eva pūrvam*<sup>10</sup> *kartavyam syāt: tathā sati makāra sparṇas*<sup>11</sup> *tatpare*<sup>12</sup> *śakāre chatvam*<sup>12</sup> *āpanne sañ----* *iti syāt: tan mā bhūd ity etat sūtram upapannam eva.*

(1) B. om., excepting *lokavidhānān na*. (2) G. M. -*vasya*. (3) G. M. -*rasya*. (4) G. M. put before *prāptam*. (5) G. M. O. om. (6) G. M. put before *asti*. (7) G. M. -*itativān*. (8) G. M. *chatvāpādakasya sūtrasya malopasya ca chatvāpādakasyāi 'va sapūrvatvāt*. (9) W. B. O. om. (10) G. M. om. (11) B. -*ṣa*. (12) G. M. *tasye 'ti makāre nākaram*. (13) B. *pare*.

38. *śakāraḥ pratishedhārthakaḥ: vālmīker mate pakārapūrvah*<sup>2</sup> *śakāraḥ-śakāram*<sup>3</sup> *nā* *'padyate. yathā: an-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -*dhākarśhakaḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *papū-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *chatvam*.

find the reading *ādityān cḥmagrubhīh*, which would satisfy neither side. There is one other case of the collision of *n* with *gr* (at v.6.7<sup>3</sup>), where I find read *n chr*. So also, at v.7.1<sup>3</sup> my MS. has *n chv*; and at vii.3.14, *n chy*. These are the only instances, I believe, which the text affords of the combinations contemplated by the rule.

The commentator, at the end, declares this rule and the preceding not approved, and with reason: the evident intent of the treatise is that the conversion of initial *c* to *ch* shall take place in all the cases falling under rule 34.

प्रथमपूर्वो हकारश्चतुर्थं तस्य सस्थानं प्लान्निकौण्डिन्यगौतमपौष्करसादीनाम् ॥ ३८ ॥

38. According to Plākshi, Kāuṇḍinya, Gāutama, and Pāushkarasādi, a *h* preceded by a first mute becomes a fourth mute corresponding with the latter.

The examples of this, the approved and customary combination of an initial *h* with a final surd mute, are, as given by the commentator, *arvāg ghy enam* (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>), *sarad dhavā avasya* (v.3.12<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *avasya*), and *tad dhiranyam* (v.4.2<sup>3</sup> and vi.1.7<sup>1</sup>). In giving the first two quotations, W. O. G. M. (following a vicious and indefensible mode of combination, which occasionally appears even in carefully written Vedic manuscripts, and has incautiously been admitted into some edited texts) write *ghgh* and *dhdh* instead of *ggh* and *ddh*; and in the latter of them my MS. of the Saṁhitā does the same (see the note to xiv.5). As counter-examples, establishing the restrictions imposed by the rule, we have *pratyāñ hotāram* (vi.3.1<sup>5</sup>), *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>), *vashat te* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>); and, in W., *ā 'tishthipat te* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>), but in all the other MSS. *tat te* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.).

This is one of several instances in which the Prātiçākhyā, instead of stating first, categorically, its own doctrine, and then mentioning others at variance with this, puts forward the conflicting views of different authorities, without appearing itself to decide in favor of any one against the rest. The commentator here points out (at the end of the chapter) that the present rule presents the accepted doctrine of the treatise, the three that follow being dis-

37. *pāushkarasāder mate vyañjanaparaḥ śakāra sparṣapūro 'pi chatvañ nā 'padyate: śakārapūro nakāraḥ ca śakārañ nā 'padyate. yathā: ād-----: pāp-----: pūrva ity ukte nakāra iti kathañ labhyate. śakārapattir asyādi 've 'ti brūmaḥ: prasaktasyādi 'va' hī' pratishedhāt. vyañjanam asmāt param iti vyañjanaparaḥ.*

*nāi 'tat sūtradvayam iṣṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *eva*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*āha*.

approved; but this does not satisfy us. We might, to be sure, regard ourselves as justified in assuming that the doctrine of the authors of the work is first stated, with due and respectful mention of the authorities upon whom they especially rely in maintaining it: but such an assumption does not in all cases help us out of the difficulty.

अविकृत एकेषाम् ॥ ३९ ॥

39. According to some authorities, it remains unchanged.

That is to say, the authorities here referred to would read, for example, in one of the passages already quoted (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>), *arvāk hy enam*.

As the euphonic treatment of *h* as a sonant instead of a surd letter is one of the most perplexing anomalies of the Sanskrit phonetic system, such indications as this of the fluctuating and antagonistic views of the old Hindu phonetists respecting it, and the willingness of some of them to give it the value of a surd in making combinations, are worth a great deal to us.

चतुर्थे अन्तरे शैत्यायनादीनाम् ॥ ४० ॥

40. According to Çaityâyana and others, a fourth mute is interposed.

These respectable authorities would, if their views are not misrepresented, approve the very strange-looking and hardly defensible reading *arvākgh hy enam* (so writes W., with the utmost possible explicitness; B. reads *arvāk hya hy*; O. gives *arvāgh hy*; G. M. have *arvāghy*). The commentator tells us (one would like to know on what authority) that the "others" are Kāuhālīputra, Bharadvāja, Old Kāundinya, and Pāushkarasādi. All are mentioned elsewhere (see Index) in the text itself.

38. *plākshīprabhṛtīnām mate prathamapūrvo hakāras tasya prathamasya sasthanām caturtham bhajate. yathā: arv----- sarad----- tad----- evampūrva iti kim: prāt----- hakāra iti kim: vāk----- va----- ā'ti----- prathamah pūrvo yasmād asāu prathamapūrvah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

39. *ekeshām mate prathamapūrvo hakāro 'vikṛto bhavati. yathā: arv-----*

40. *çaityâyanaādīnām mate hakāraprathamayor antare madhye prathamasaasthanāṇaṁ caturthāgamo bhavati. yathā: arv----- ādicabdena kāuhālīputrabharadvājasthavirakāundīnyapāushkarasādayo' grhyante.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-ñḍīnyānām*, and then a lacuna to *pūjārtham* under the next rule.

मीमांसकानां च मीमांसकानां च ॥४१॥

41. As also, according to the *Mīmāṃsakas*.

The especial mention, in a separate rule, of the agreement of this school with the view of *Çaityāyana* and his abettors, is made, says the commentary, with an honorific intent.

He adds, as was above remarked, that rules 39 to 41 are disapproved.

## CHAPTER VI.

CONTENTS: 1-5, conversion of *s* and *h* into *sh*; 6-13, exceptions and counter-exceptions; 14, insertion of *s* between final *n* and initial *t*.

अथ षकारः सकारविसर्जनीयौ ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for conversions of *s* and *visarjanīya* into *sh*.

An introductory heading to the rules of this chapter—excepting the last rule.

स्वानासोदिव्यापोक्ष्यमुकमूमोप्रोत्रीमह्यविपद्यवय-  
हपूर्वः ॥ २ ॥

2. A *s* is converted into *sh* when preceded by *svānāso divi*, *āpo hi*, *ayam u*, *kam u*, *ū*, *mo*, *pro*, *trī*, *mahi*, *dyavi*, *padi*, or a former member of a compound.

The illustrative passages, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *uta svānāso divi shantv agneḥ* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *agneḥ*; B. omits both that and the preceding word): with the

41. *cakārah pūrvoktavidhim anvādicati: mīmāṃsakānām cā 'nturāgamamātaṁ sammataṁ. pūrvoktaṁ evo. 'dāharanam. mīmāṃsakānām' pūjārtham prthaksūtrārambhah. nāi 'tat sūtratrayam iṣṭam.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivaraṇe  
pañcamo 'dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. to here.

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: sakāravisarjanīyāu shakāram āpadyete ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaram yad vak-shyāmaḥ.*

counter-example *trītyasyām ito divi soma āsīt* (iii.5.7<sup>1</sup>), to show the powerlessness of *divi* to effect the change except after *svānda-sah*. Then *āpo hi shthā mayobhuvah* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>: v.6.1<sup>4</sup>: vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the last word): the necessity of *āpo* is shown by the counter-example *na hi svah svān hinasti* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>). Next *ayam u shya pra devayuh* (iii.5.11<sup>1</sup>), and *kam u shvid asya senayā* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): with the counter-example *tad u soma āha* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), to prove that *u* changes *s* only after *ayam* and *kam*. For *ū*, the example is *ūrdhva ū shu na ūtaye* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word): the other passages in which it exerts a like influence upon an initial *s* are i.5.11<sup>5</sup>: iii.5.10<sup>1</sup>: iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>: v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: vii.1.18<sup>2</sup>: 4.17<sup>2</sup>. For *mo*, the only passage is the one quoted, *mo shū na indra* (i.8.3). For *pro*, only *pro shv asmāi puroratham* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>). For *tri*, only *trī shadhasthā* (ii.4.11<sup>2</sup> and iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>). For the three remaining words, also, the text affords only the single examples given by the commentator: *mahi shad dyuman namah* (iii.2.8<sup>2</sup>), *ya upa dyavi shtha* (ii.4.14<sup>5</sup>), and *padi shītām amuñcatā yajatrāḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>7</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). To the prescription conveyed in the last item of the rule, which seems to demand that every *s* beginning in *pada*-text the latter member of a compound should be changed to *sh*, rule 7, below, makes the very important general exception "not after a consonant or an *α*-vowel;" it means, then, that *s* is so changed after the *i*, *u*, and *r* vowels and the diphthongs. The commentator illustrates only one or two of the cases in which the conversion would be required: *hañsah gucishad vasuh* (iy.2.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *guci-sat*: only G. M. have the first word), *ayā vishthā janayan* (i.7.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *vi-sthāḥ*: only G. M. have *ayā*), and *goshṭoman dvitīyam* (vii.4.11<sup>1</sup>).

I have collected from the Sanhitā all the words coming under the operation of this part of the rule, concerning the initial *s* of the latter member of a compound (just about a hundred in number, and some of them of quite frequent occurrence), but I do not think the list worth the trouble of giving here. So far as regards the Prāṭicākhya and its relation to them, the important point is to determine whether its rules and exceptions precisely cover them—and I have to say that I have not succeeded in discovering any want of exact adaptedness to them. There is a single participle, *anusthita*, whose unaltered *s* is unnoticed and unprovided for in the chapter, but it occurs only as final member of a compound, *vishṇvanusthitah* (ii.4.12<sup>3,4,5</sup>; p. *vishṇu-anusthitah*), and so, not being itself separated into its constituents, is exempted from the action of the present rule.

2. ----- *ity evampūrvo 'vagrahapūrvaḥ ca sakārah shakāram*  
*āpadyate. yathā: uta-----: svānda-sa' iti kim: trt-----: āpo*  
*-----: āpa iti kim: na-----: ayam-----: kam-----: ayamkam*  
*iti kim: tad-----: ūrdh-----: mo-----: pro-----: trī-----:*  
*mahi-----: ya-----: padī-----: hañs-----: ayā-----: go-----*  
*avagrahaḥ pūrvo yasmād asāv avagrahapūrvaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *svāna*.



for *nis*, *nī śtanihi duritā* (iv.6.6<sup>7</sup>: all the manuscripts of the comment, along with my manuscript of the Sanhitā, read thus, as required by ix.1: compare the similar cases noted under rule 13, below). A number of counter-examples are given, showing the effect of absence of any one of the conditions contained in the rule: they are *sadane sīda samudre* (iv.3.1), *brhataḥ çarmani syām* (iv.1.5<sup>1</sup>), *vi śimat-ḥ surucaḥ* (iv.2.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit this example), and *abhi savanā pāhi* (i.4.10,11).

The cases coming under this rule are not so numerous but that it may be worth while to report them. Of verbal forms after *ac hi* I have found none; after *abhi*, I have noted *abhi shyāma* (i.4.46<sup>3</sup>), and forms of *abhi śhiñeāmi* (i.7.10<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *abhi śhunomi* (iii.1.8<sup>2</sup>); after *prati*, forms of *prati śthāpayāmi* (i.7.5<sup>2</sup> et al.), and *prati śtobhanti* (ii.2.12<sup>3</sup>); after *pari*, forms of *pari śhicye* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup> et al.), and *pari śthāt* (i.7.13<sup>3</sup>); after *vi* (besides that quoted under rule 13, below), *vi śhajanti* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>), and forms of *vi shyāmi* (iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>); after *nī* (besides the one under rule 13), *nī śha-sāda* (i.8.16<sup>1</sup> et al.), and forms of *nī śhīdāmi* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup> et al.). Such cases as *nī-śhādāyati* (v.3.7<sup>2</sup>), where the preposition, losing its accent before the accented verbal form, is combined with the latter in the *pada*-text, belong under rule 2, above. The same is the case with *vyātishajet* (vi.6.4<sup>2</sup> et al.), where the verb has two prepositional prefixes, and is therefore written in combination with them (*vi-ātishajet*), and with altered sibilant. But for this circumstance, we should require a separate and special treatment of the word; for *ati* is by this Prātiṣākhya (i.15) excluded from the list of *upasarga*, 'prepositions,' and so could not by the present rule cause the alteration of an initial *s* of a root. *Anu* is also thus excluded, whence the passage *anu sthana* (v.6.1<sup>3</sup>) does not fall under the rule, and the retention of its dental sibilant needs no specific authorization. It is the only case, so far as I have discovered, in which the restriction of the class of prepositions to half its usual number has any bearing upon the objects of this rule.

रासःसप्तैग्निर्निर्विडुमीडुःपायुभिर्वैःसुमतिर्माकि रीयुरायुरा-  
भिःसधिर्नकिस्तकारपरो नित्यम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also the *visarjanīya*, when followed by *t*, of *agniḥ* preceded by *rāsaḥ* or *sapte*, and of *nīḥ*, *viduḥ*, *mīdhuḥ*, *pāyubhiḥ*,

4. *sarvānudātte pade vartamanaḥ sakāra upasargapūrvō nishpūrvō vā śhatvam āpadyate. yathā: aḥm-----: imān-----: sām-----: yaj-----: nī-----: etāny' upasargapūrvāni<sup>2</sup>. nishpūrvam api: nī śh-----: evampūrvā iti kim: sad-----: brh-----: sarvānudātta iti kim: vi-----: abhi-----: pada iti kim: kālārtham: padakāle<sup>3</sup> 'nudātta ity arthaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. etc. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -rgā. <sup>3</sup> W. -kā a.

*dhish tava* (iv.2.32, 11<sup>3</sup>). And for *nakish*, *nakish tam ghnanti* (ii.1.11<sup>4</sup>): *nakish tam* is found also at i.8.22<sup>4</sup>.

The final specification of the rule, *nityam*, 'under all circumstances,' is explained as intended to assure the inclusion in the rule of the word *avidushtarāsaḥ* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>), already quoted, which would otherwise be liable to exclusion by the operation of rules 8 and 9, below. The word *viduḥ* itself, we are told, is all right, because of its specific mention in the text, but a little additional force is needed to bring in *aviduḥ* as its hanger-on. The explanation is by no means of the most satisfactory character, but I have nothing to suggest in its place. We have already once (see note to iii.8) had a case arising under i.52 treated as demanding a special handling.

अथ न ॥ ६ ॥

6. Now for exceptions.

An introductory heading, of force in the rules that follow (through rule 13).

अवर्णव्यञ्जनशकुनिपत्युतुमृत्युमलिस्तुबृहस्पतिपूर्वः ॥ ७ ॥

7. Excepted is a *s* preceded by an *a*-vowel, a consonant, *cakuni*, *patni*, *rtu*, *mṛtyu*, *malimlu*, or *bṛhaspati*.

The bearing of the first two items of this rule on those which precede it has been noticed under rule 2. The commentator's examples are, for a preceding *a*-vowel, *antarikshasad dhota* (i.8.15<sup>2</sup> et al.: only G. M. have the second word) and *ā siñcasva* (i.4.19: but G. M. omit the passage), of which one falls as an exception under rule 2, the other under rule 4; and, for a preceding consonant, *rksāme vāi* (vi.1.3<sup>1</sup>). Then, for the words specified, we have *cakunisādena* (v.7.14), *patnisamnyājānām* (ii.6.10<sup>4</sup>: G. M. read *-yājāh*, which is found twice in the same division of the same section, but not elsewhere), *rtusthās tasya* (v.7.6<sup>6</sup>: the same compound is found at v.5.8<sup>1</sup>), *mṛtyusamnyuta iva* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *iva*), *nāi*

6. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ne 'ty etad' adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttarām yad vakshyāmaḥ*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *vadayāmaḥ*.

7. *avarṇapūrvō vyañjanapūrvāḥ ca cakuni----- bṛhaspati: ity' evampūrvāḥ ca' sakārah shakāram' nā 'padyate. yathā: ant-----: avagrahapūrvatvāt 'prāptiḥ: 'ā siñ-----: upasarga-pūrvatvāt prāptiḥ: r̥k-----: śak-----: patn-----: rtu-----: mṛt-----: nāi-----: bṛh-----: 'avagrahapūrvatvād eśhām prāptiḥ*<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *shatvam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *eshām*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om.; W. adds *sa visasyaḥ: avagrahapūrvatvāt prāptiḥ*.

would also come under the rule, as being *anudātta* throughout, and also entitled to the designation *pada*, 'word,' equally with completely independent vocables: hence the necessity of providing for their exclusion from its action. The commentator illustrates with a couple of examples: *tāsyām devā' ādhi saṁvāsantah* (iii.5.1<sup>1</sup>), and *mūkham yajñā'nām abhi saṁvidānē* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). W. B. O. introduce a third, between the other two, namely *abhi sām agachantē 'ti* (ii.5.3<sup>7</sup>); but, as is shown by the accentuation and division, it does not fall under either the fourth rule or this, and has evidently come in by somebody's blunder.

It is very possible that the Sanhitā contains other cases requiring the application of this rule; but if so, they have escaped my notice.

## सवस्थानम् ॥ १० ॥

10. Also in *sava* and *sthānam*.

The cited passages are *agnisavaḥ cityaḥ* (v.6.1<sup>5</sup>), *anusavanam purodācān* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup> and vii.5.6<sup>4</sup>), *savanesavane 'bhi gr̥hṇāti* (vi.4.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.11<sup>3</sup>), *prasavāya sāvitraḥ* (vi.6.5<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word; and the whole example is a blunder, since there is no where a rule requiring the lingualization of the sibilant in *prasavāya*), and *gacha gosthānam* (i.1.9<sup>1,2</sup>).

The word *sthānam* being cited with its special case-ending, the rule would not apply to such forms as *sthānaḥ*, *sthānī*, which in fact occur in the compound *pratiśthāna* (ē. g. i.7.6<sup>6</sup>: ii.4.4<sup>1</sup>), with their sibilant converted to *sh*. *Sava*, however, having no case-ending, falls under rule i.22, and is employed as "part of a word, in order to the inclusion of a variety of cases," as the comment duly points out, and as his selected examples illustrate.

## न धिपूर्वे ॥ ११ ॥

11. But not when *dhi* precedes.

The examples are *adhishavanam asi* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>: W. omits this example), *adhishavane jihvā* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>), and *adhishthānam āram-*

10. *sava*: *sthānam*: *ity' etayoḥ sakārah shakāram' nā "pad-yate. save 'ti paddīkaḍego bahūpādānārthāḥ'. agn-----: anus-----: sav-----: pras-----: gacha-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *shatvaṁ*. <sup>3</sup> B. *bahūnām padānām arthāḥ*.

11. *sava*: *sthānam*: *ity' ayoḥ' sakāre' dhipūrve' nishedho na prasarati. yathā: adh-----: adh-----: adh----- dhi 'ty ayaṁ varnaḥ' pūrvo yasmād asū dhipūrvāḥ: tasmin.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. *etayoḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *sakārasya pūrva*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put first. <sup>4</sup> W. om.

(vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>), as examples of the alteration of *san*. *Sani* would not cover all the cases; and the treatise makes no provision for the citation of a theme ending in *i*, or any other vowel than *a*, as representative of all the forms derived from that theme. For *sa-bheyah* is quoted *susabheyo ya evam* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *evam*). For *sattvā*, *abhisattvā sahojāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read everywhere, in text, commentary, and Sanhitā, *satvā*). And for *sasyāyā*, *susasyāyā supippalābhyah* (i.2.2<sup>3</sup>).

All these are exceptions under rule 2, being cases of compounds whose second member begins with *s*, after a vowel other than an *a*-vowel. The commentary tries (with much discordance between the different manuscripts: see the various readings below) to claim two of them as exceptions under rule 4; but there is no ground for so doing.

## न स्वर्ग्यर्थास्त्रीमसाहससारयिस्फुरतीस्तुब्ज्योति- रायश्चतुःपूर्वस्तो ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not in *svara*, *spardhāḥ*, *starima*, *sāhasra*, *sārathih*, *spshuranti*, *stubbh*, and in *sto* when preceded by *jyotiḥ*, *āyuh*, or *catuh*.

Of these words, the first six constitute counter-exceptions under rule 8, which excepted words containing *r* or *r* from the conversion of their initial *s* into *sh*. The examples, as quoted by the commentator, are as follows: *amba ni shvara* (i.4.1<sup>2</sup> and vi.4.4<sup>3</sup>); *vi shpardhāḥ chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>)—these two, it is noted, are cases under rule 4, of unaccented verbal forms after a preposition—*su-sharimā jushānā* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>); *dvishāhasram cinvita* (v.6.8<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *cinvita*), and *trishāhasro vā asāu lokah* (v.6.8<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *vā*)—both forms are, we are made to observe, included in the citation of *sāhasra* by its theme-ending *a*, according to rule i.22: other forms do not occur in the Sanhitā, nor these elsewhere than in the two divisions quoted from—*kāmayate sushārathih* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>); and *vishphuranti amitrān* (iv.6.6<sup>2</sup>).

The next case is a very anomalous one, being the conversion of *s* into *sh* after *a*, contrary to the first specification of rule 7. The phrase is *sashtup chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>; p. *sa-stup*). Compare similar cases as noted in Ath. Pr. ii.95.

The combination of *sto* with the three words mentioned, although

13. ----- *stup*: *ity eteshu sakārah*: *jyotiḥ*: *āyuh*: *catuh*:  
*evampūrvac ca* *sto ity atra sakāra rākārarephavati* (vi.8):  
*avarṇavyaṇjana* (iv.7) *iti co 'ktaṁ nishedham nā* *padyate*:  
*kim tu shatvam pratipadyate*: *iti pratiprasavārtho* *yam nakā-*  
*rah*. *yathā*: *amba*-----: *vi sh*-----: *upasargapūrvatvād anayoḥ*  
*prāptih*: *susht*-----: *grahanasya ca* (i.22) *iti vacanād akā-*  
*ragrhitam* *sāhasragrahanam anekārtham*: *yathā*: *dvish*-----:

देवात्सवनेपशूस्तकारपरः सकारं प्राकृतो नित्ये प्रा-  
कृतो नित्ये ॥ १४ ॥

14. In *tarhān*, *tasmin*, *lokān*, *vidvān*, *tān*, *trīn*, *yushmān*, *ūrdhvān*, *ambakān*, *ṛtān*, *açman*, *kṛvān*, *pitṛn*, *anān*, *kapālān*, *tish'han* when accented on the first syllable, *nemir devān*, and *savane paçūn*, an original *n*, followed by a *t*, becomes *s*, when the *t* is a constant one.

There seems to be no particular reason why this rule is introduced here, instead of anywhere else in the work, as it has no relation with the rest of the contents of the chapter. It is a complete rehearsal of the cases in which the old *s*, with which most Sanskrit words in *n* originally ended, is retained under the protection of a following initial *t*. The combination, of course, is historically identical with that of *n c* into *ñç*, treated of in the preceding chapter (v.20: see the note upon that rule). The "conversion" of *n* into *s*, as the treatise chooses to state the case, involves, by xv.1-3, the prefixion of *anusvāra* to the sibilant.

The examples quoted by the commentator are as follows. For *tarhān*, *çatatarhañs trīhanti* (i.5.7<sup>6</sup> and v.4.7<sup>4</sup>). For *tasmin*, *tasmiñs tvā dadhāmi* (i.6.5<sup>1</sup>; 7.5<sup>1</sup>). For *lokān*, *imān eva lokāñs tīrtvā* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>): there is another case of *lokāñs* at ii.3.6<sup>1</sup>. For *vidvān*, *ya evaṁ vidvāñs trāidhātavīyena yajate* (ii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: G. M. stop with *-yena*: the *Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā* has *paçukāmo* before *yajate*, which W. B. O. have doubtless dropped out by an oversight). For *tān*, *kaksheshv aghāyavas tāñs te dadhāmi jambhayaḥ* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words, and they omit the last one): *tāñs* is also found at ii.4.11<sup>4</sup>: iii.1.9<sup>5</sup>: iv.1.10<sup>2</sup> twice: vi.3.1<sup>4</sup> twice; 4.10<sup>3,4</sup>. For *trīn*, *trīñs trcān anu* (ii.5.10<sup>1</sup>). For *yushmān*, *yushmāñs te 'nu* (iii.2.5<sup>6</sup>): we find *yushmāñs* again at vii.1.5<sup>2</sup>. For *ūrdhvān*, *yān ūrdhvāñs tān upabādimataḥ* (iii.1.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word). For *ambakān*, *tryambakāñs trītyasavaṇam akurvata* (iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). For *ṛtān*, *ṛtāñs tanvate kavayah prajānatīḥ* (iv.3.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit after *tanvate*). For *açman*, *açmañs te kshut* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup> and v.4.4<sup>1</sup>). For *kṛvān*, *punaḥ kṛvāñs tvā pitaram yuvānam* (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>: only W. has the last word). For *pitṛn*, *oja iti pitṛñs tantur iti* (v.3.6<sup>1</sup>:

14. ----- ādyudātte tishṭhangrahaṇe----- eshv grahaṇeshu  
prākṛto nakārah padasamaye<sup>2</sup> vartamānas takāraparah sakāram  
āpadyate. yathā: çat-----: tasm-----: imān-----: ya-----:  
kaksh-----: trīñs-----: yush-----: yān-----: tryam-----: ṛt-----:  
-----: açm-----: punaḥ-----: oja-----: prān-----: api vikṛ-  
tam (i.51) iti vacanād etad bhavati: dvād-----: tribh-----:  
ādyudātta iti kim: na-----: apy akārādi (i.52) iti prāptiḥ:  
nem-----: nemir iti kim: jāt-----: mādḥ-----: savāna iti kim:

and eighty, and presume that I may have overlooked here and there others, so that there would be in all ten times as many instances of the omission as of the insertion. In the Atharva-Veda (see second marginal note to Ath. Pr. ii.26) the condition of things is quite different: while the whole number of collisions is much less (only ninety-five), the sibilant is introduced in considerably more than two-thirds of them (in sixty-seven cases, against twenty-eight). The comparison is of some interest in its bearing upon the question of the relative age of the two texts.

## CHAPTER VII.

CONTENTS: 1-12, cases of the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*; 13-14, of *t* and *th* into *ṭ* and *ṭh*; 15-16, exceptions to the conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

अथ नकारो णकारम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for conversion of *n* into *ṇ*.

An introductory heading, stating the subject of the chapter (with the exception of rules 13 and 14). We have treated here all the cases with which the Prātiçākhyā has properly to deal, as arising in the process of conversion of *pada*-text into *saṃhitā*: chapter thirteen (rule 6 seq.) takes up the occurrence of *n* in a different way, determining every instance in which that letter is found in the whole Sanhitā.

पुषूकृधिसुवःसमिन्द्रास्थूर्युवाःषट्त्रियामनिष्वर्चः ॥ २ ॥

2. *N* becomes *ṇ* when preceded by *shu*, *shū*, *krdhi suvah*, *saṃ indra*, *asthūri*, *uru*, *vāh*, *shat*, *tri*, *grāma*, or *nih*.

The commentator's illustrative examples are as follows. For *shu*, *ūrdhva* *ū shu nah* (iv.1.4<sup>2</sup> and v.1.5<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first word); and, as counter-example, *gr̥heshu nah* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), where *shu*, not being a complete word, does not (by i.50) linguelize the nasal: but G. M. omit this passage and the accompanying explanation. For *shat*, *mo shat na indra* (i.8.3). The commentator points out

1. *athe'ty ayam adhikārah*: *nakāro nakāram āpadyata ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vākshyāmah.*

2. ----- *evampūrvo nakāro nakāram āpadyate. yathā*: *ūrdh-----*: *gr̥h----- ity atra natvaṃ na bhavati padagrahaneshv* (i.50) *iti vacandī*.<sup>2</sup> *mo-----*: *susū*<sup>3</sup> *ity etayor yadā shatvaṃ nā'sti tadā natvanishedhārthan vāṅkṛtagrahanam*: *ya-*

O. omits the first word), and *nirupyamānām abhi mantrayeta* (i.6.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word). A counter-example, showing *hanyāt* without altered *n*, is *na ni hanyān na lohitaṁ kuryāt* (ii.6.10<sup>2</sup>).

## पारीपरिपरीप्रपूर्वः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also after *pārī*, *pari*, *parī*, and *prā*.

The illustrative citations of the commentator are *pārīnahyasye* "ce (vi.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *pari no rudrasya* (iv.5.1d<sup>4</sup>), *viravantam parīna-sam* (ii.2.12<sup>6</sup>), and *pra no devī sarasvatī* (i.8.22<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *pārī* (p. *pārī-nahyasya*: compare iii.7) there is no other case; nor for *pari* (p. *pari-nasam*: compare iii.7); for *parī*, I find only *pari nayati* (ii.3.4<sup>3</sup> et al.). But for *pra* the examples are quite numerous: we have *pra nah* at i.5.11<sup>4</sup>; 6.4<sup>3</sup>; 7.10<sup>2</sup> twice: ii.5.12<sup>1</sup>; iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>; 3.11<sup>4</sup>; iv.2.6<sup>5</sup>; v.5.7<sup>5</sup>; vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>; *pra nāmā-ni* at iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>; forms of *pra nayāmi* at i.6.8<sup>1</sup> et al., of *pra nude* at ii.1.3<sup>5</sup> et al.; *pranindya* at i.3.5; *prānīyamānah* at iv.4.9<sup>1</sup>; *pra nenekti* at vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>; *prānī* at ii.5.9<sup>2</sup>; *prānīti* at i.4.18 and *su-prānīti* (but p. *su-prānīti*) at i.5.11<sup>5</sup> et al., *prānetar* at iii.5.11<sup>3</sup>, and *pranava* at iii.2.9<sup>6</sup>. *Parānuttī* occurs only in composition (vi.2.3<sup>2</sup>; p. *bhrātrvya-parānuttīdī*).

## अवर्णव्यवेतो अपि ॥ ५ ॥

5. And that, even when an *a*-vowel intervenes.

The word "even" (*api*) here brings down by implication, according to the commentator, the words in the preceding rule from *pari* on—that is to say; virtually, *pari* and *pra*, for there is no case of *parī* exercising such an effect. The examples for *pari* are *agram pary anayat* (ii.3.4<sup>3</sup>: all but O. omit *agram*: I find besides only *pary anayan*, at vi.5.7<sup>2</sup>), and *paryānīyā havanīyasya* (vii.1.6<sup>5</sup>). For *pra*, we have *prānīya svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>; p. *pra-anīya*), and *anu prā 'nyāt prathamām* (v.5.5<sup>2</sup>; p. *pre 'ti: anyāt*: only O. has *anu*). The occurrence of *prāna* is very frequent: of other cases, I have noted only *prā nudata* at vi.2.3<sup>2</sup>, and *prā 'nudanta* at vi.4.10<sup>3-4</sup>—where, however, the lingualization of the *n* is suspended in our text, as at present constituted, by the intervention

4. ----- *evampārvo nakāro nakāram āpadyate. yathā: pār-*  
-----: *pari*-----: *vīr*-----: *pra*-----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

5. *apiṣabdaḥ paryādy<sup>1</sup> anvādiṣati<sup>2</sup>: paryādiṣārvo<sup>3</sup> nakāro*  
*avarṇavyaveto 'pi natvam bhajate<sup>4</sup>. yathā: agram*-----: *pary-*  
-----: *prān*-----: *anu*----- *avarṇavyaveta iti kim: pari*-----  
*pra*-----

<sup>1</sup> B. *pār*-. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -*ādēṣakah*. <sup>3</sup> B. *pār*-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *āpadyate*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om.

*suprāyana* (v.1.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *su-prāyanaḥ*) and *agnishtomaprāyana* (vii.2.9<sup>1</sup>; p. *agnishtoma-prāyanaḥ*). For *yavena*, *prayavena* *pañca* (iv.3.11<sup>2</sup>; p. *pra-yavena*). *Van*, again, is (by W. alone) declared a part of a word, intended to include many cases: only two are given, *yadī vā tāvat pravaṇam* (ii.4.12<sup>1</sup>), and *āhavanīyāt pravaṇaṁ syāt* (vi.2.8<sup>4</sup>), nor have I found any other, except the compound *purastātpravaṇaḥ* (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>; p. *purastāt-pravaṇaḥ*). Finally, we have a couple of counter-examples, showing the necessity of the implication from the preceding rule: they are *asī havyavāhanaḥ* (i.3.3), and *udayanam veda* (i.6.11<sup>2</sup>).

## प्रापूर्वश्च ॥ ७ ॥

7. As also, when preceded by *prā*.

The "also" (*ca*) of this rule brings forward from the preceding rule only the word last mentioned there, namely *van*. The example is *prāvanebhiḥ sajośhasaḥ* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>; p. *pra-vanebhiḥ*: compare iii.5). I have noted no other case.

## इन्द्रोऽयजुःपूर्व एनकेन ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also *enam* and *kena*, when preceded respectively by *indraḥ* and *ayajuh*.

There is nothing in the rule meaning 'respectively,' and if *enam* were found anywhere in the text preceded by *ayajuh*, or *kena* by *indraḥ*, their *n*'s would doubtless require lingualization: yet the evident intent of the precept is as translated. The passages are *indra enam prathamah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>), and *yad ayajushkena kṛīyate* (v.1.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *ayajuh-kena*: G. M. O. omit *yat*). I find no other cases falling under the rule: there are, however, one or two other forms, analogous with the latter of those here contemplated, which we might expect to find treated in the same way, namely *anāgīr-kena* and *sāgīrkena* (i.6.10<sup>4</sup>); but they are written by the *pada*-text without division of *āgīrkena*, or restoration in it of the dental *n* (thus: *anāgīrkena*, and *sa-āgīrkena*).

Counter-examples are added: to show that *enam* and *kena*, when otherwise preceded, retain their dental nasals, *rudra enam bhātva* (iii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *brahmavādīnaḥ kena tad ajāmī'ti* (vii.4.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. end with *kena*); to show that *indraḥ* does not exercise a lin-

7. *cakārākṛṣṭe<sup>1</sup> vann iti grahane nakāraḥ pre 'ty evampūrvo natvam bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: prāv-----*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*ṣṭa*; O. *cakāro 'nvādishto*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

8. *indraḥ: ayajuh: pūrvayor<sup>1</sup> enam: kena: ity etayor nakāro natvam bhajate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: indra----- yad----- evampūrva iti kim: rudra-----: brah-----: <sup>3</sup>enamkene<sup>4</sup> 'ti kim: indro-----<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *ity evampūrva*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> W. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *lene*.



*navī rakshohanāu* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word), and *vrtra-haṇam purāṇḍaram* (iii.5.11<sup>4</sup> and iv.1.3<sup>3</sup>; p. *vrtra-haṇam*: G. M. omit the last word). For *han*, besides the compounds here quoted, which are found repeatedly in other passages, the Sanhitā affords us also *avīrahanāu* (i.2.8<sup>2</sup>; p. *avīra-hanāu*); for the other two words I know of no additional examples. Counter-examples are given, namely *sāhna evā 'smā* (vi.6.11<sup>4</sup>; p. *sa-ahne*), and *valagahanāḥ* (i.3.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

There is good ground for questioning the correctness of the commentator's interpretation of *ra* in the rule as signifying the letter *r* (*repha*), and not the syllable *ra*. In none of the examples given are the words specified directly preceded by *r*, and it is not at all in accordance with the usage of the treatise to describe as "having *r* before it" a word preceded by another word containing *r*. All the versions of the comment, however, unite in this interpretation, and it is farther assured by the quotation of the rule above, under i.19, as a case in which *r* is called *ra*, instead of *repha*. It looks as if G. M. had made a blundering attempt to remedy the difficulty by reading the third word *ahan* instead of *han*, and also by understanding *shaḥ* to mean 'the letter *sh*' (see the various readings, below), thus parallelizing the two specifications. The attempt, however, is an abortive one, only issuing, if carried out, in a host of new difficulties. I have made the translation of the rule conform to the requirements of the comment, but with much misgiving, having hardly a doubt that the meaning properly is 'when preceded by *ra* or *shaḥ*.'

## रूप्वी मयान्यनी ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also *mayāni* and *anī*, when preceded by *ru*.

The passages are *dārumayāni pātrāni* (vi.4.7<sup>3</sup>; p. *dāru-mayāni*: O. omits *pātrāni*; G. M. omit the whole example), and *tve vasāni purvaṇika hōtāḥ* (i.3.14<sup>2-3</sup>; p. *purva-anika*: O. omits the first two words, G. M. the last): *purvaṇika* is found also at

11. *havani<sup>1</sup>: ahne: han<sup>2</sup>: eshu<sup>3</sup> grahaṇeshu nakāro rephapūrvah<sup>4</sup> 'sha ity<sup>5</sup> evampūrvō<sup>6</sup> vā natvam bhajate. yathā: agnih-----: gar-----: hann<sup>7</sup> iti padārikadeṣo bahūpādānārthaḥ: raksh-----: vāish-----: vrtr----- evampūrva iti kim: sāhna-----: val.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *havani*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ahan*. <sup>3</sup> W. *evan*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *shakāra*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. *ekamp*; G. M. *pūrvō*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *ahann*.

12. *mayāni: anī: ity atra rūpūrvō nakāro<sup>2</sup> natvam bhajate. yathā: 'dārum-----' tve----- evampūrva iti kim: anī-----: agnaye-----: rephagrahaṇena kim: svan.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *anī*, as also (with T.) in rule; G. M. *anika*, as also in rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put after *atra*. <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om.

a chapter where they do not belong, and where they sorely disturb the natural and desirable connection. Considering their near relation to the rules of the preceding chapter, they might better have been added there as an appendix; or else put at the head of chapter vii., before its general *adhikāra*.

Only a single illustrative example is quoted, namely *pari antarikshāt* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>), where rules 4 and 5 of this chapter combined would require *an* at the beginning of the second word, but for the exception here made.

This precept is an anticipation of one of the items of xiii.15, below, and might properly enough be looked upon as open to the charge of *punarukti*, or unnecessary repetition, which the treatise so carefully shuns, and the commentator not seldom labors hard to remove. It is characteristic of the method of the Tāittirīya-Prâtichākhyā that it does not attempt to state the real *nimitta* or occasion of the lingual *n* in the words rehearsed here, although it does so, fully and distinctly, in rule xiii.6, where the subject of the occurrence of *n* in the interior of a word is taken up.

नह्यतिनूनंनृत्यत्यन्योन्याभिरन्यान्यतश्चातश्च ॥ १६ ॥

16. Nor in *nahyati*, *nūnam*, *nrtyanti*, *anyaḥ*, *anyābhiḥ*, *anyāni*; nor when final.

The *ca* in this rule indicates the continuance of the exception. These words, and a final *n*, are not subject to the rules given in the chapter for the substitution of lingual *n*. The commentator quotes as follows. For *nahyati*, *vāsasā paryānahyati* (vi.1.11<sup>2</sup>; *p. pari-ānahyati*: O. omits the first word): he notes that the case constitutes an exception to rule 5. For *nūnam*, *pra nūnam pūrnavandhuraḥ* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *nrtyanti*, *pari nrtyanti* (vii.5.10). For the three cases of *anya*, *prā 'nyaḥ gaṇsati* (vii.5.9<sup>3</sup>), *prā 'nyābhir yachaty anv anyāni mantrayate* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pra* in all these three examples, and in this, along with G. M., the last three words; B. omits the last word), and *prā 'nyāni pātrāni* (vi.5.11<sup>1,2</sup>): the commentator remarks that all these (since *nahyati*) are cases of exceptions under rule 4. He then proceeds to raise the question why the three complete words

15. *vāghāśhādīvidhir<sup>1</sup> anadhikṛtatvād utpannapradhvāṇsī: tasmād atra<sup>2</sup> nā 'yaṁ nishedhaḥ<sup>3</sup>: 'kim tu' prakṛto<sup>4</sup> natvavidhir anena vishayīkriyate. takāraparo nakāro natvaṁ nā 'padyate. yathā: pary-----: pāripariparīprapārvauḥ* (vii.4): *avar navyaveto 'pi* (vii.5) *ity etābhyām<sup>5</sup> prāptiḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. *vāghādi*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *tatra*. <sup>3</sup> B. *viśeṣaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *prāk*. <sup>6</sup> W. B. *ādibhyām*.

16. *nishedhākaraśhakaṣ cakārah<sup>1</sup>: ----- eshu<sup>2</sup> grahaṇeṣhu nakārah padāntaṣ ca<sup>3</sup> natvaṁ nu bhajate<sup>4</sup>. yathā: vās-----: avar navyaveto 'pi* (vii.5) *iti prāptiḥ: pra-----: pari-----: prā*

## उत्तमपर उत्तमः सवर्गियम् ॥ २ ॥

2. A first mute, followed by a last mute, becomes a last mute of its own series.

The examples selected by the commentator to illustrate this mode of combination are *vāñ ma āsan* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>), *shannavatyāñ svāñ* (vii.2.15), and *tan mahendrasya* (vi.5.5<sup>3</sup>). For the conversion of *p* into *m* he is able to offer no instance, as none occurs in the *Sanhitā*. As counter-examples, showing that only a nasal causes the conversion, and causes it only in a "first" mute, he brings up *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the last word), and *imāñ no vācam* (vi.4.7<sup>3</sup>).

All the *Prātiśākhyas* join in treating this conversion as necessary, not as alternative with conversion into a sonant (see note to *Āth. Pr.* ii.5).

## तृतीयः स्वरघोषवत्परः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant, it becomes a third mute.

The examples are *ṛdhag ayāḍ ṛdhag uta* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>), and *yad vāñ hotā* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>).

## ककुच्च मकारपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Also in *kakut*, when *m* follows.

Namely, in the passage *kakudmāñ pratārtir vājasaramaḥ* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>; p. *kakut-māñ*: G. M. O. omit the last word). As counter-examples are given *ya unmādyet* (iii.4.8<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit *yāñ*), and, according to W. B., *kakut trayastriṅgaḥ* (vii.2.5<sup>3</sup>); for which G. M. O. substitute *kakuc chandaḥ* (iv.3.12<sup>2</sup>). The commentator

2. *uttamaparaḥ prathamāḥ* <sup>1</sup> *savargiyam uttamam āpadyate. yathā: *vāñ*-----: *shañ*-----: *tan*----- *evampara iti kim*: *vāk*-----: *prathama iti kim*: *imāñ*----- *uttamāḥ paro yasmād asāv uttamaparaḥ*.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *āmanāḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om.

3. *svaraghoshavatparaḥ* <sup>1</sup> *prathamāḥ savargiyam tṛtīyam āpadyate. yathā: *ṛdhag*-----: *yad*-----: *ity ādi. svarāḥ ca ghoshavantaḥ ca svaraghoshavantaḥ*: *te pare yasmād asāv* <sup>2</sup> *sa ta-thoktaḥ*.*

<sup>1</sup> B. om.; G. M. O. *svaraparo ghoshavatparaḥ ca*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

4. *kakud ity asmin grahaṇe 'ntyo varṇo' mākarāparaḥ cakā-rākrṣtaṁ savargiyam* <sup>1</sup> *tṛtīyam āpadyate* <sup>2</sup> *yathā*: *kakud*-----

## न रेफपरः ॥७॥

7. But not before *r*.

*R*, although a sonant consonant, and therefore included in the preceding rule, requires a different treatment in the final *visarjanīya* before it. What this different treatment is, is pointed out farther on in the chapter (rule 16 seq.). The examples here given are *suvo rohāva* (i.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and *ahorātre* (i.5.9<sup>7</sup> et al.: W. O. add *pārgve*, but there is no such collocation of words in the Sanhitā, and I suspect the word to be a corrupted reading for *prāvigan*, which follows next at the place referred to).

ह्यारभार्वाह्यारबिभरजीगरकरनन्तर्विवःसुवःपुनरहरहः-  
प्रातर्वस्तःशमितःसवितःसनुतस्तनुतस्तोतर्केतःपितर्मा-  
तर्त्यष्टरेष्टर्नेष्टस्वष्टः ॥ ८ ॥

8. *Visarjanīya* becomes *r* in *hvāh*, *abhāh*, *vāh*, *hāh*, *abibhah*, *aṣṭigah*, *akah*, *anantah*, *vivah*, *suvaḥ*, *punaḥ*, *ahar-akah*, *prātaḥ*, *vastah*, *ṣamitah*, *savitah*, *sanutah*, *stanutah*, *stotah*, *hotah*, *pitah*, *mātaḥ*, *yashṭah*, *eshṭah*, *neshṭah*, and *tvashṭah*.

With this rule begins the detail of the cases of an original *r* after *a* and *ā*, which is protected and brought to light by a following sonant letter, being treated in quite a different manner from an original *s*, although both *r* and *s* are represented, as finals, by the indifferent *visarjanīya*. The commentator points out at the end the rules to which these cases constitute exceptions, namely ix.7,9,10. His illustrative examples are as follows. For *hvāh*

7. *rephaparo visarjanīyo repham nā* "padyate. *yathā*<sup>1</sup>: *suvo*  
-----: *ahor*-----: *ghoshavattvād rephasya pūrvavidhiprāptiḥ*.  
*rephah paro yasmād asāu rephaparah*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om.

8. <sup>1</sup>----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *visarjanīyo repham āpadyate svaraghoṣhavat-  
paraḥ*<sup>2</sup>. *yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *mā*-----: *yonāv*-----: *vār*-----: *mā me*-----:  
*ab*-----: *oṣh*-----: *dev*-----: "karāvar anudātte *padē*" (viii.9)  
*iti*<sup>4</sup> *vakshyati*: *tendī* 'vāi' 'tad' *api sidhyati*<sup>5</sup> *apy akārādi* (i.52)  
*iti vacanāt*: *iti cet*: *māi* 'vam': *anudātte kaṣṣabde tad bhavati*:  
*idam tv anyasvarārtham iti*<sup>6</sup>: *yathā*<sup>10</sup>: *arvā*-----: "ādyudāttas  
*tv idam*<sup>11</sup>. *yajña*-----: *antar anādyudātte* (viii.10) *iti vak-  
shyati*: *tasmād ankārādi ca*<sup>12</sup> (i.53) *iti vacanāt sidhyati*: *iti  
cet*: <sup>13</sup>*māi* 'vam': *anādyudātte tad bhavati*: *ādyudāttārtham*<sup>14</sup>  
<sup>15</sup>*idam grahaṇam*<sup>16</sup>. *ca* -----: *suvar*-----: *punar*-----: *ahar*

ponding passage, iv.1.1). For *suvaḥ*, *suvar asi suvar me yachā* (v.7.6<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): the numerous passages in which this word occurs it would be quite useless to rehearse. For *punaḥ*, *punar āsadya sadanam* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word): this, too, is of too frequent occurrence to be worth detailed reference. For *aharahah*, *aharahar havirdhānindam* (ii.5.6<sup>3</sup>): the same repetition of *ahah* is found further at i.5.9<sup>6</sup> twice,<sup>7</sup>; ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>. In connection herewith is made the remark that *ahah* when not at the end of a separable compound is the subject of rule 13, below; but that that rule does not apply to a case like the one here in hand. For *prātaḥ*, *prātar upasadaḥ* (vi.2.3<sup>3</sup>): *prātaḥ* is found also at i.4.7: ii.1.2<sup>3</sup>; 5.6<sup>3</sup>: iii.1.7<sup>1</sup>; 3.8<sup>4</sup>; 4.10<sup>1</sup>: vi.4.2<sup>1</sup>. For *vastaḥ*, *doshā-vastar dhiyā vayam* (i.5.6<sup>2</sup>; p. *doshā-vastaḥ*): also at i.2.14<sup>4</sup>. For *gamitaḥ*, *ṛtaṇ havish gamitar iti trishatyāḥ* (vi.3.10<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word, only O. the last). For *savitaḥ*, *deva savitar etat te* (iii.2.7<sup>1</sup>): the word is found also in about a dozen other passages. For *sanutaḥ*, *ārāc cid dveshaḥ sanutar yuyotu* (i.7.13<sup>5</sup>). For *stanutaḥ* we are simply referred to "another text" (*gākhāntara*): but G. M. read *sanutar*, and omit *stanutar* in the rule itself. For *stotaḥ*, *etaṇ stotar etena* (vii.4.20). For *hotaḥ*, *hotar yavishtha sukrato* (i.2.14<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.14<sup>5</sup>; 6.2<sup>2</sup>: iv.3.13<sup>2</sup>: v.1.4<sup>5</sup>: vi.3.8<sup>2</sup>; 4.3<sup>3</sup>. For *pitāḥ*, resort is had to the *jatā*-reading, since the only passage (iii.8.9<sup>1</sup>) in which the word occurs does not bring to view the *r*: thus, *maruṭdm pitāḥ pitar maruṭdm maruṭdm pitāḥ*. For *mātaḥ*, *prthivi mātār mā mā hiṇsā* (iii.3.2<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *yashṭaḥ*, *agne yashṭar idam namaḥ* (i.1.12). For *eshṭaḥ*, again a *jatā*-reading, *agṇy' eshtar eshtar agṇyā 'cny' eshtaḥ* (i.2.11<sup>1</sup>): its treatment before the word which follows it in *samhitā* is the subject of rules 18–22 of this chapter; that of the preceding word, of x.14. For *neshtaḥ*, once more the *jatā* is drawn upon, *neshtaḥ patnīm patnīm neshtar neshtaḥ patnīm* (vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>). For *vashtaḥ*, finally, *givas vashtar iḥā' gahi* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word): also at i.3.7<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>1</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: vi.3.6<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>2</sup>.

The commentary adds a couple of counter-examples, illustrative of the fact that these words show their *r* only before a vowel or sonant consonant: they are *abibhas tam bhātāni* (ii.5.1<sup>2</sup>), and *punas te mdi 'shām* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>).

## करावरनुदत्ते पदे ॥ १ ॥

9. Also in *kaḥ* and *avaḥ*, in an unaccented word.

The cited examples are: *mithuyā kar bhāgadhēyam* (i.3.7<sup>2</sup>), and

9. *kaḥ*: *avaḥ*: *ity etayor visarjanīyāḥ padakāle 'nudātte' pade vartamānaḥ svaraghoshavātparaḥ repḥam āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: mith-..... suruco..... anudātta iti kim: ko.....: 'avo.....' evampara iti kim: adhi.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -tta. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om.

deed, whether *ānantah* was not fairly included in the present rule, since the *antah* part of it, at any rate, is not “accented on the first;” but the treatise chooses to avoid so nice a question of interpretation, and to take the safe side.

आवृत्परः ॥ ११ ॥

11. Also a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvrt*.

The quoted examples are *jinvar āvrt svāhā* and *ugnar āvrt svāhā* (both ii.4.7<sup>1</sup>: B. has *bhīmar* for *ugnar*; O. reads in each case *āvrt*, according to the requirements of rule xiv.12). Other instances in the same and following divisions of the same section are *bhīmar āvrt*, *tveshar āvrt*, *grutar āvrt*, and *bhūtar āvrt*. The anomalous combination does not occur elsewhere.

इतिपरो ऽपि ॥ १२ ॥

12. And likewise when *iti* follows.

The word *api* in this rule, we are told, brings forward the implication of “a *visarjanīya* followed by *āvrt*.” According to the commentator’s exposition, further, the rule is intended to apply to the *jaṭā* repetition of *grutah* with its predecessor *iti*: as, *iti grutah grutar iti ti grutah* (ii.4.7<sup>2</sup>). Nor do I see of what other interpretation it is capable, although it seems strange that the irregular conversion of *h* into *r* should be retained in the *jaṭā*-reading of this word only, and not of the others, where repeated with their respective predecessors. It is clearly implied that we are to read, for example, in the first case falling under the preceding rule, *varshan jinvo jinvo varshan varshan jinvaḥ*.

As counter-example, showing the necessity of the implication signified by *api*, we receive *rtubhir havanagrutah* (ii.4.14<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit the first word; G. M. add *havam*, but no such word follows in the *Sanhitā*, and the addition is doubtless a copyist’s error—possibly growing out of the attempt to repeat the compound, in its *pada* or *jaṭā* form). Here both the *pada*-text (as the word is a compound) and the *jaṭā* (as it stands before a pause) would read *havanagruta iti havana-grutah*, the ordinary *sandhi* being made of *grutah* and *iti*.

अहारहःसुवरनिग्यान्तः ॥ १३ ॥

11. *āvrt ity evamparo visarjanīyo repham āpnoti. jin v-----: ugn-----.*

12. *apicabda āvrtparam<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyam anvādiṣati: asāu visarjanīya itiparo repham āpnoti. iti gr----- anvādeṣaḥ kim-arthah: rtu-----: iti<sup>2</sup> paro yasmād asāv itiparaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. O. -*paro*; G. M. -*para*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *iti*; O. *itīcabdaḥ*.

ed. But he replies, reasonably enough, that, as the rule says "when not the final member of a separable word," it is to be inferred that the words specified do occur as such members; and with *hāh* that is not the case; wherefore the distinction would be meaningless with reference to *hāh*. And it would be a poor enough side to take, and altogether unworthy of approval, to give a direction which did not apply to a word itself, but only to that word with a prefixed. Hence the quotation is made in proper form.

Just as long a discussion might have been raised with equal reason over *ahāh* and *suvaḥ*, both of which are also included in the former rule. So far as *ahāh* is concerned, indeed, it is easy to see that this is the general rule, applying to the cases of occurrence of that word in the main, with a specific restriction; and that *ahāh-ahāh* in rule 8 is a sort of exception in advance, made for a single case which would otherwise fall under this restriction (since, in *ahāh-ahāh*, the second *ahāh* is in fact the final member of a compound). But I am unable to discover any justification of the way in which *suvaḥ* is treated: it is made the subject of two general rules, to the one of which a needed restriction is attached, to the other, not. For *ahāh* and *suvaḥ*, the present rule should, it seems, have taken distinctly the form of an exception merely: *nā 'hāh-suvar iṅgyāntāu*; 'not, however, *ahāh* and *suvaḥ*, when final members of compounds;' and *ahāh* should have been separately treated, or else included with them and a further counter-exception added.

## न भिर्यापरः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Not, however, when followed by *bhiḥ* or *bhyām*.

There is violation of the ordinary usage of the *Prātiçākhyā* in this rule also. The only one of the words mentioned in the preceding rule which is found with the case-endings *bhiḥ* and *bhyām* following it is *ahāh*; and hence, to it alone the present precept applies. We should expect it, therefore, in accordance with the principle of which i.58 is an expression, to have been placed last in the trio of which it forms a member. The commentator does not remark upon the irregularity, but simply points out that the

*yānta ity ukter<sup>1</sup> iṅgyāntatvam<sup>10</sup> iti<sup>11</sup> sambhāvanīyam: tac ca hār ity evamrūpe<sup>12</sup> grahaṇe nā 'stī 'ty<sup>13</sup> atre 'dam viçeṣhaṇam anarthakam syāt: tathā 'py<sup>14</sup> evamrūpe mā bhād iti<sup>15</sup>: 'kiṁ tv<sup>16</sup> akārādīve bhavati 'ti jaghanyaḥ pakṣaḥ: na tu saralaḥ: iti sūtre<sup>17</sup> 'hār<sup>18</sup> iti grahaṇam upayujyate.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *eshu padeshu*. <sup>2</sup> W. -yā. <sup>3</sup> W. *anīṅgyāntāh*; O. -tā. <sup>4</sup> O. *āpnucati*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. 'vā. <sup>8</sup> O. *tatra gauravadoshap*; G. M. *tatra gūgavadeshop*. <sup>9</sup> W. *ukten*; G. M. O. *ukte*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -āntam. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *apī*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. O. -pa. <sup>13</sup> W. om. *iti*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. O. *sati*: a better reading. <sup>15</sup> O. om. <sup>16</sup> G. M. om.; O. *kiṁ tv apy*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. O. *sūtarām*. <sup>18</sup> MSS. *ahār*.





expect to hear him reply—because *ahah* also is twice mentioned, in the same two rules with *suvaḥ*. But no; we do injustice to the tenderness of his exegetical conscience, in supposing him capable of such gross arbitrariness of interpretation, when in rule 8, instead of *ahah*, *aharahah* is read. He alleges instead the competency of a form cited for another purpose (compare Rik Pr. i.13, r. liv,55): we have read in rule iv.11 *ahorātre*, where the *pragrahas* are under treatment, and this suffices, by analogy of form, to determine the reading also of *ahorātrābhyām* and *ahorātrayoh*. If this be so, it is next retorted, then, as the *sh* of *adhishavane*, which is cited in the same rule, is assured by the citation itself, rule vi.11, prescribing the *sh*, in the way of an exception to an exception, is out of order. That is true, the commentator confesses: but, granting that the *sh* of *sava* is established by the previous mention of *adhishavane*, how is that of *sthāna*, the other word specified in the same rule, established? the rule is therefore to be deemed of force so far as relates to that word, and to be regarded as intended for it. Of what follows, not all is clear to me: it appears that the rule is, after all, defended as it stands, on “the principle of sugar-candy and little tongue” (i. e. as merely giving more than is absolutely required of what one cannot receive too much of, as the palate of candy—?): for to establish the reading on the authority of a previous citation is only doing just what will answer (? *gamānikā* occurs in only one other passage, the comment on i.18, and I find nowhere any thing that explains its use), while specific mention is a distinction; hence the rule has a meaning as applied to *sava* also: such is the understanding.

The commentator might much better, surely, have acknowledged that his text-book had omitted to provide for the special case of *jatā*-reading which has caused all this trouble, than have forced it within the contemplation of the rules at such cost.

दीर्घं च पूर्वः ॥ १७ ॥

17. And the preceding vowel is made long.

The “and” (*ca*) in the rule is declared to signify that the lengthening of the vowel takes place only when *visarjanīya* has been omitted. The cited examples are *rurā rūdrah* (v.5.19), *tittirī rohit* (v.5.16), and *viṣṇū rūpaṁ krtvā* (vi.2.4<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have the last word). As was noticed in the comment upon the preceding-rule, there is no such case of *ah* changed to *ā* before *r*, except the one forming the special subject of the following rules.

17. *tasmād rephaparavisarjanīyāḥ lupāt pārvo 'pi' yaḥ svarō hrasvaḥ sa ca dīrgham āpadyate. yathā: rurā..... tittirī..... viṣṇū..... yathā<sup>3</sup> visarjanīyasya lopas tadāi 'va dīrghatvam yathā syād ity evamarthaḥ caṣabdhah.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. Q. ins. *tasya*.

18. There can be little question that Vararuci's explanation is the true one.

In rule 21, below, we have yet another mode taught of arriving at the same result as regards the reading.

द्वावुत्तमोत्तरीयस्य रेफम् ॥ २० ॥

20. According to Uttamottariya, two become *r*.

Here, again, there are two interpretations, Vararuci giving one, Māhisheya the other. The former says that, in the opinion of the specified authority (*gākḥin*, 'holder of a *gākhā* or recension of the sacred text'), the *visarjanīya* of *eshtaḥ* and the following *r* both become *r*—that is, as I should think it ought to mean, both fuse together into a single *r*: thus, *eshtarāyaḥ*—but none of the manuscripts give this reading in illustrating the case: see the various readings below. Māhisheya, on the other hand, regards the individual referred to as owning the portentous name Dvāvutamottariya, and as holding that the *h* of *eshtaḥ* becomes *r* before *r*, making *eshtar rāyaḥ*.

Vararuci here maintains, in my opinion, his usual superiority over Māhisheya, as regards both the plausibility of the name assumed and the admissibility of the reading taught; and I have accordingly made my translation conform with his interpretation.

It is interesting to note the uncertainty of the tradition within reach of the commentators as to the personality of the authorities quoted by the Prātiśākhya.

सांकृत्यस्योकारम् ॥ २१ ॥

21. According to Sāṁkrṭya, the *visarjanīya* becomes *u*.

And this *u*, by x.5, unites with the preceding *a* to form *o*, so that the reading of the passage is *eshṭo rāyaḥ*, as it is according

19. *ekeshām mata eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephaparo na lupyate: ata eva pūrvasvaradīrghābhāvaḥ ca: kiṁ tu ghoshavatparaḥ ca (ix.8) 'ity otvam'. yathā: eshṭo rāyaḥ. vararuciviracitam etat: māhisheyabhāshitān tv' evam: eshtar iti visarjanīyo rephaparo 'repham nā' 'padyata it'. 'siddharūpam ubhayoh samānam.*

(1) W. om. (2) G. M. om. (3) G. M. ca. (4) G. M. na repham āpnoti. (5) O. om. na.

20. *uttamottariyasya gākḥino<sup>1</sup> mata eshtar iti visarjanīyas<sup>2</sup> tatparo rephaḥ ca dvāv etāu repham āpadyete. yathā: eshtar<sup>3</sup> rāyaḥ. ayam artho vdrarucoktaḥ: māhisheyoktas tu dvāvutamottariya iti kasya cin nāma: tanmata eshtar<sup>5</sup> iti visarjanīyo rephaparo repham āpadyate: <sup>6</sup> eshtar<sup>7</sup> rāya iti<sup>8</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -nor. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -yaḥ ca. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. -tā; O. -tār. <sup>4</sup> W. B. O. var-. <sup>5</sup> W. B. eshta rāya. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. yathā. <sup>7</sup> B. G. M. -tā. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om.

23. At the end of the former member of a compound, before *k*, *kh*, or *p*, *visarjanīya* becomes *sh*—or *s*, if preceded by *a*.

The commentator notes the fact that, as a different following occasion is here introduced, the implication “followed by a vowel or a sonant consonant,” which has so long been in force (namely, since rule 3 of this chapter), comes to an end. His illustrative examples are: *atho havishkrīdānām eva* (vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *eva*), *grasitām nishkṛhidati* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word), *bahishpa-vamāna ipasadyah* (vi.4.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word), *namaskārār evāi nam* (v.5.7<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *enam*), and *pathaspathaḥ paripatim* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word). As counter-example, to show that the *h* must end the first member of a compound, not an independent word, we have *pushpāvatīḥ prasūvatīḥ* (iv.2.6<sup>1</sup>), and *namaḥ pitrōbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *abhi*).

This is a general rule, applying to almost all the compounds in the Sanhitā which show a final *h* before an initial *k*, *kh*, or *p* of the second member. A few exceptions are mentioned farther on (rules 32, 33).

आविर्निर्ऋतः शश्वतोऽपसोन्विरिषोऽहसोऽतिदिवोवि-  
श्वतोऽश्मनस्तमसः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Also in *āvīḥ*, *nīḥ*, *iḍaḥ*, *ṣaṣvataḥ*, *apasah*, *deva rishah*, *añhasah*, *ati divah*, *viṣvataḥ*, *aṣmanah*, and *tamasah*.

This rule, the commentator remarks, relates to words which are not first members of compounds. His examples are: for *āvīḥ*, *āvish krīṇushva* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>). For *nīḥ*, *ghṛtaṁ nish pibati* (ii.3.11<sup>3</sup>):

23. *atra paranimitavigeshanādī etatparyantā svaraghoshavat-parānuvṛttir mantavyā. avagrahāntavartī visarjanīyah kakāra-khakārapakāraparah shakāram āpadyate: akārapūrvāḥ cet sukāram. yathā<sup>1</sup>: atho-----: gras-----: bahish-----: namas-----: pathas-----: avagraha iti kim: push-----: namaḥ-----: kakāraḥ ca khakāraḥ ca pakāraḥ ca kakhapakārāḥ: te<sup>2</sup> pare<sup>3</sup> yas-mād asāv<sup>4</sup> tathoktaḥ. akāraḥ pūrvo yasmād asāv akārapūrvāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -shād. <sup>2</sup> W. śāvātā. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -paratvān-. <sup>4</sup> W. -havatara; B. -ha; G. M. -havatī. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> O. etc. <sup>7</sup> G. M. parā. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. sa.

24. <sup>1</sup>----- *eshu<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyah kakhapakāraparo<sup>2</sup> yathāvihi-tam<sup>3</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>4</sup>: āvish-----: ghṛtaṁ-----: iḍas-----: ṣaṣv-----: apasas-----: uror-----: deve<sup>5</sup> ti kim: sa-----: añhasas-----: ati-----: atī<sup>6</sup> ti kim: divah-----: viṣv-----: tvam-----: ud-----.*

*anavagrahārtho 'yam ārambhah.*

<sup>(1)</sup> G. M. āvirādishu vidyamāno. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. ins. hi shakāram akārapūrvāḥ cet sa-kāram iti. <sup>(3)</sup> G. M. -ihāsamh-. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. O. om.

By its terms, the rule means that the prescription of the preceding rule becomes void when either of the words there mentioned is followed as here specified; but the cases of its application, so far as I am aware, all concern *kr̥dhi*. The commentator's illustrations are: *tān ma āmanasaḥ kr̥dhi svāhā* (ii.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the first two words, and it omits the last one), *gam ca naḥ kr̥dhi: kratve dakshāya* (iii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the last word), and *uru kshayāya naḥ kr̥dhi: ghṛtaṁ ghṛtayone* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word); and to the second of these there is a counter-example, *uta no mayas kr̥dhi kshayadvīṛāya* (iv.5.10<sup>2</sup>), to show that only *kr*, not *k* alone, gives occasion for retention of the *h*. The words *āmanasaḥ kr̥dhi svāhā* occur again at ii.3.9<sup>2</sup>: I find no other cases to be specified in addition to those quoted by the commentator.

## पत्नीविपतीपतेपतयेपतिष्यतिपरः ॥ २७ ॥

27. Also before *patnī ve*, *patī*, *pate*, *pataye*, *patih*, and *patim*.

The examples are: first, *brahmanas patnī vedim* (iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, to show that the word *patnī* must be followed by *ve*, *retodhāḥ patnī va ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: but O. reads *indriyāvataḥ patnīvantam*, i.4.27); further, *śubhas patī idam aham* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *aham*), *vāstosḥ pate prati* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>), *pracyavasva bhrūvas pate* (i.2.9 and vi.1.11<sup>4</sup>), *vācas pataye pavasva* (i.4.2), *vācas patir vācam* (i.7.7<sup>1</sup>), and *vācas patim viśvakarmānam ūtaye* (iv.6.2<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word). The inquiry is now raised, why it was necessary to give all these words in detail, instead of comprehending them all in *pat*, and in reply is quoted the passage *divam gacha suvaḥ pata* (iv.1.10<sup>5</sup> and v.1.10<sup>5</sup>).

The cases of retention of *s* before the cases of *patī* are so numerous, that it would be highly convenient to be able to dispose of them at once by quoting in the rule the theme *patī*; but such a proceeding is permitted (by i.22) only with themes ending in *a*. I add the other combinations of this class which I have noted from the Sanhitā: *manasas pati* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>), *pathas pati* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>), *brahmanas pati* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup>; ii.1.57), *jyotishas pati* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>; iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>), *śavasas pati* (ii.2.12<sup>7</sup>), *jagatas pati* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), *sadasas pati* (ii.6.8<sup>2</sup>; iii.2.4<sup>4</sup>), *patinas pati* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>; iv.4.4<sup>1</sup>), *nabhasas pati* (iii.3.8<sup>3,6</sup>), and *yas patih* (iv.7.14<sup>3</sup>). We have the genitive *pateḥ* in *br̥has-pateḥ* (i.7.8<sup>4</sup>), but, as the *pada*-text reads *br̥haḥ-pateḥ*, the word does not fall under this rule: *tapaspati* (i.2.10<sup>2</sup>; p. *tapah-patih*)

27. ----- *evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvikītam<sup>1</sup> bhajate. ya-*  
*thā<sup>2</sup>: brah-----: va iti kim: reto-----: śubh-----: vāst-----*  
*pra-----: vāc-----: vāc-----: vāc-----: pad ity etāvātā<sup>3</sup> va*  
*siddhe<sup>4</sup> \*pratipadapāthēna kim<sup>3</sup>: divam----- ityādinīshedhār-*  
*thā<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. -*vidhim*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*ṭhah kimarthaḥ*; O. -*ṭho*. <sup>4</sup> O. -*ādāu n*.

to show that only *po*, not *p* when otherwise followed, calls out the prescribed effect in *rāyah*.

I have not attempted to note the numerous instances of the occurrence of *rāyas posha* in the Sanhitā. In the derivative *rāyas-poshavani* (i.2.12<sup>3</sup>; 3.1<sup>2</sup>), where the division is before *vani*, the *pada*-text, according to its custom, leaves the *s* of *rāyas* unchanged (reading *rāyasposha-vani*).

## नमस्कारोपरः ॥ ३० ॥

30. Also in *namaḥ*, before *karo*.

The examples illustrating the action of the rule are *samvatsarena namas karomi* (v.5.7<sup>3</sup>), and *ubhayibhyo namas karoti* (ii.6.9<sup>3</sup>: O. reads *karomi*); counter-examples, showing the uselessness of either specification of the rule without the other, are *namaḥ kapardine ca* (iv.5.5<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>1</sup>: W. omits *ca*; O. omits the example), and *ekahadyand enah karoti* (vi.6.3<sup>1</sup>).

Other instances of *namas karoti* are found at v.5.5<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>: vi.3.8<sup>4</sup>; and of *-vatsarena namas karomi* at v.5.7<sup>3</sup> twice, 7<sup>4</sup> twice.

The printed text has *greyasas karat* and *vasyasas karat* (but, by a strange inconsistency, immediately after, *paçumataḥ karat*) at i.8.6<sup>2</sup>; but, as these combinations are unauthorized by the Prāṭicākhya, and not supported by my manuscript, I do not doubt that the readings are erroneous.

## वसुष्कारपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Also in *vasuḥ*, before *k*.

The passage is *sa idhāno vasuḥ kavīḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), and I have found no other. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are given: *viprah çuciḥ kavīḥ* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>; 5.5<sup>3</sup>), *mayi vasuḥ puro vasuḥ* (iii.2.10<sup>2</sup>), and *viçvāvasuḥ pary amuṣṇāt* (vi.1.6<sup>5</sup>, 11<sup>5</sup>: B., which is quite defective just along here, omits the first word).

## नाधरविश्वतोऽन्तर्जातोविविशुःपरुःपुनः ॥ ३२ ॥

30. *nama ity atra<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyaḥ karo ity evamparo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> bhajate. yathā<sup>3</sup>: sa m v----- ubhay----- 'karo iti kim: namaḥ-----<sup>4</sup> 'nama iti kim: ekaḥ-----<sup>5</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -vidhim. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.; B. omits to here. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. put before *ubhay*; B. puts after *ubhay*-----, and om. *karo iti*.

31. *'vasur ity atra visarjanīyaḥ kakāraparo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> dpadyate<sup>3</sup>. yathā<sup>4</sup>: sa----- vasur iti kim: viprah-----: evampara iti kim: mayi-----: viçvā-----*

(<sup>1</sup>) B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -vidhim. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. bhajate. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om.

*bahihparidhi skandāt* (ii.6.6<sup>2</sup> and vi.2.8<sup>5</sup>: the same divisions contain each a second example of the compound), *purushahpurusho nidhanam* (vi.6.3<sup>2</sup>: the same division contains a second example of the compound), and *ubhayatahkskshār bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). I have noted besides only *parushahparushah pari* (iv.2.9<sup>2</sup>). That the word containing *dh* or *sh* must follow the *visarjanīya*, not be the one that itself ends in that letter, is shown by the counter-examples *adhaspadam kṛṇute* (iv.7.13<sup>3</sup>), and *ṛtasya jyotishas patim* (i.5.11<sup>1</sup>).

## परिवाप्रपरः ॥ ३४ ॥

34. Not before *pari vā* or *pra*.

The examples are *rocanaḍ divah pari vājeshu* (iv.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have the first word)—with the counter-example *divas pari prathamam* (i.3.14<sup>5</sup> and iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>), to show the need of citing *vā* after *pari*—and *tasmād itahpradānam devāh* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup>: O. omits *devāh*). Of these, the first is an exception under viii.28; the other, under viii.23. There is yet another passage, *bahihprāno vāi manushyah* (vi.1.1<sup>4</sup>), which needs to be brought under the rule; and the commentator accordingly declares that the quotation of *pra* in this rule with short *a* is intended to connote *prā* also—just as, in a rule of the next chapter (ix.24), *athā* connotes *athā* also, by a converse principle. This, however, suggests a difficulty: why then is not rule vii.7, prescribing for *prā* an effect which had already been

*nā* "padyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: *bahih*-----: *puru*-----: *ubhay*-----: *kakhapakāra*<sup>3</sup> (viii.23) *iti prāptih. parabhāta iti kim: adhas*-----: *ṛtasya*-----<sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *sūtre*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *dhakāra*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *shakārap*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. om.; G. M. *pūrvav*-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-vidhīm*. <sup>8</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> B. *-rapara*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *tasmān iti nīdīṣṭe pūrvasya. parivāpravarah*.

34. *pari vā: pra: 1 evamparo visarjanīyo yathāvihitam<sup>2</sup> nā* "padyate. *rocanaḍ*-----: *ve* 'ti *kim: divas*-----: *tasmād*-----: *pre* 'ti *hrasvagrahanam dīrghasyā* 'py *upalakshanam: 3 yatho* 'dathāpara<sup>4</sup> *ca* (ix.24) *iti dīrghagrahanam hrasvasyo* 'palakshanārtham<sup>4</sup>. *tārhi prāpūrvac ca* (vii.7) *iti sūtram vyartham: prapadasyā* <sup>5</sup> 'nuvṛttasyā<sup>6</sup> 'va *dīrghopalakshakatvād:* *iti cet: ucyate: pratyakshagrhitasyā* 'vo 'palakshakatvam<sup>7</sup> *nā* 'nu-krśhtasye 'ti *viññeyam: 8 tathā hi: vāhanauhyamānaḥ* (vii.6) *ity atra*<sup>9</sup> *cakāreṇa prapadastatrā* 'nukrśhtāḥ: *atra tu*<sup>10</sup> *parivāprapara*<sup>9</sup> *ity* <sup>10</sup> *upalakshakatvam*<sup>11</sup> *bhavati. tathā satī* 'dam *apy udāharanam: bahih*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-vidhīm*. <sup>3</sup> B. ins. <sup>(4)</sup> here, as well as below, in its place. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *-nam*; B. *hrasvop*-. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *eva*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-kshanatvād*; O. *dīrghagrahanasyop*-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-tvād*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *vā*-. <sup>10</sup> G. M. ins. *prapara* *iti pratyakshagrahitatvād*; O. ins. *pratyakshagrhitatvād*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-kshanam*.

## CHAPTER IX.

CONTENTS: 1-6, treatment of final *h* before initial surd letters; 7-10, treatment of final *ah* and *dh*; 11-15, of final diphthongs before initial vowels; 16-17, of the particle *u*; 18-19, duplication of final *ñ* and *n*; 20-24, conversion of final *an*, *in*, *un*, to *ān*, *īn*, *ūn*.

## उष्मपरो ऽघोषपरे लुप्यते काण्डमायनस्य ॥ १ ॥

1. *Visarjanîya*, when followed by a spirant which has a surd letter after it, is dropped, according to Kāṇḍamāyana.

The commentator, after a brief paraphrase of the rule, gives a couple of examples to illustrate its working: namely, *catustanām karoti* (v.1.6<sup>4</sup>; p. *catuḥ-standm*), and *vāyava stho 'pāyava stha* (i.1.1). The mention of Kāṇḍamāyana is declared to be made on account of a difference of views: others, namely, hold that *h* is dropped before a spirant that is followed by a sonant letter as well, as *adbhya'svāhā* (i.8.13<sup>3</sup>), *ye guklā syus tam* (ii.3.1<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *tam*), *yo hatamānā svayampāpāḥ* (ii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *yo*; G. M. omit *pāpāḥ*), and *dānakāmā me prajā syuḥ* (ii.2.8<sup>3</sup>; 3.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word; G. M., the first two). I am not sure that I understand the consideration further alleged, in view of which it is decided that "the rule is all right;" it appears to be that, reference having thus been made to a discordance of views, those words will be hereafter specified in which there is omission made under any other prescription—but what this refers to, I am unable to see.

Every MS. that I have reads '*ghoshaparo* as second word in the rule: but the comment so plainly implies the reading *-pare*, and the sense so obviously requires it, that I have ventured its adoption.

Although the prescription here given is put upon the authority of an individual, it is pretty evidently to be regarded as definitely

1. *ūshmaparo visarjanîyah kāṇḍamāyanasya mate lupyate tasminn ūshmany aghoshavatpare<sup>1</sup> sati. yathā: catu----- vāy----- kāṇḍamāyanagrahaṇam<sup>2</sup> vikalpārtham: anyeshām mate ghoshavatpare<sup>3</sup> py ūshmani visarjanîyo lupyate: yathā: adbhya----- ye-----: yo-----: dāna----- evam ca vikalpāprayane<sup>4</sup> sati lakṣhaṇāntaragataim<sup>5</sup> yeshu padeshu lupyate tāni padāni vakshyāma<sup>6</sup> iti vacanam saralam bhavati.*

*ūshma paro yasmād 'asūv ūshmaparah<sup>7</sup>: na ghoshavān agho-shah<sup>8</sup>. asūv<sup>9</sup> paro yasmāt 'sa tathoktah<sup>10</sup>: tasminn aghoshapare.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. *vat.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*yanasya gr.* <sup>3</sup> W. -*pravane*; O. -*prayagrahane* G. M. -*ipāntare.* <sup>4</sup> W. O. -*nātara.* <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. *prav.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sa tatho 'ktah* <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om.

3. But not when followed by *ksh*.

That is to say, *visarjanīya* remains unchanged before *ksh*, the preceding rule for its conversion to *jihvāmūliya* being annulled. There is nothing corresponding to the usage here prescribed in either of the other treatises. The commentator quotes a number of examples: *maṇaḥ ksheme* (v.2.1<sup>7</sup>), *ubhayataḥkshṇūr bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit *bhavati*: the *visarjanīya* was exempted from conversion into *s* before the *k* by viii.33), *ghanāghanāḥ kshobhaṇaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *pūrvō 'rshtuḥ kshīyate* (iii.1.7<sup>1</sup>), and *dyāuḥ kshāmd rerihat* (iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last word).

## कपवर्गपरश्चाग्निवेश्यवात्स्मीक्योः ॥ ४ ॥

4. Nor, according to Āgñiveṣya and Vālmiki, when followed by a guttural or a labial mute.

The two authorities here specified (the commentator calls them "holders of a *śākhā*, teachers"), it appears, reject altogether the *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmanīya*, since they prescribe the retention of *visarjanīya* in the only situations where those problematical sounds are liable to arise. The commentator quotes a couple of illustrative passages: *yaḥ kāmāyeta* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), and *agnih paçur āsit* (v.7.26: O. has dropped out what follows *agnih*). Then, to show that on other points these heterodox persons accept our rule 2, he cites *madhuç ca mādhavaç ca* (i.4.14 and iv.4.11<sup>1</sup>), *manas tatvāya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>: but B. substitutes *namas talpyāya*, iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *āçuç śigānaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>), *yaç somam vamiṭi* (ii.3.2<sup>6</sup>).

## ऊष्मपर एवैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. According to some authorities, not when followed by a spirant, and only then.

I believe there can be no real doubt as to the meaning of this rule, although it is not very explicitly interpreted by the commen-

3. *kshaparo visarjanīyaḥ pūrvavidhīm na bhajate. yathā*<sup>1</sup>: *man*-----: *ubhay*-----: *ghanā*-----: *pūrv*-----: *dyāuḥ*-----: *kshakārasya*<sup>2</sup> 'ghoshavattvāt praptiḥ.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om.

4. <sup>1</sup>*caḥāro nishedham ākarshati. āgñiveṣyavālmīkyoḥ*<sup>1</sup> *śākhīnor ācāryayor*<sup>2</sup> *mate* <sup>3</sup>*kavargaparaḥ pavargaparo vā*<sup>3</sup> *pūrvavidhīm* <sup>4</sup>*'nā* <sup>5</sup>*'padyate*<sup>5</sup>. *yaḥ*-----: *agnih*<sup>6</sup>-----: *kakāraç ca pakāraç ca kapāu*: *tayor vargāu*<sup>6</sup> *kapavargāu*: *tāu parāu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ. evampara iti kim*: *madhuç*-----: *manas*-----: *āçuç*-----: *yaç*-----.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. om.; O. *caçabdo nañākarshakah*: *āgn*-. (<sup>2</sup>) O. om. (<sup>3</sup>) O. *kapavargaparo visarjanīyaḥ*. (<sup>4</sup>) O. *na bhajate*. (<sup>5</sup>) O. *kavargaç ca pavargaç ca*.



to mean "in the opinion of these two authorities, it does not—that is, *h* does not follow the prescription of rule 2 either before a guttural or palatal mute or before a spirant." This is equivalent to a ratification of rule 4, and a ratification or rejection of rule 5, according as we adopt the one or the other of the two interpretations proposed for the latter; and it is, in my view, quite unsuited to the connection. The discordant explanations of some of the other views of designated authorities given in the rules of the treatise show us that the commentators had not in all cases, at least, any certain knowledge by tradition of the matters referred to, but simply interpreted as well as they were able the notices of their text-book—and we have the same right as they in this respect. If the particular point here under discussion were of more practical consequence, I should be inclined to go into a fuller discussion of it; as the case stands, it has perhaps cost us already more words than it is worth.

The commentator illustrates by repeating several of the quotations already given—namely *yaḥ kāmayaṭa* (ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.), *yaḥ pāpmanā* (ii.1.3<sup>5</sup> et al.), *āguḥ giṣānaḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>): these as direct examples; as counter-example, according to W. O., *manas tatpāya* (iv.1.1<sup>1</sup>), for which B. once more substitutes *namas talpyāya* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>), while G. M. read *agnis ca me* (iv.7.6<sup>1</sup>)—the readings of which, as regards the *visarjanīya*, each manuscript gives in its usual fashion (except that W. has this time *āguḥ giṣānaḥ*, by a blundering divergence in the wrong direction), so that we are deprived of any farther aid from that quarter to the understanding of the rule.

Finally, rules 4–6 are declared not approved.

## श्रीकारमः सर्वो जकारपरः ॥ ७ ॥

7. *Ah*, the whole of it, when followed by *a*, becomes *o*.

The commentator's cited examples are *preddho agne* (iv.6.5<sup>4</sup> and v.4.7<sup>3</sup>), *samiddho añjan* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>), and so *bravit* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.). He then enters into a long exposition intended to prove the necessity of the specification *sarvaḥ*, 'the whole of it,' in the rule. Without it, we are told, the reading *samiddho añjan* (in the second example given) would not be established: for, by i.56, alteration and omission concern only a single letter; hence, if *sarvaḥ* were omitted, only the final *visarjanīya* would be converted to *o*; this, with the preceding *a*, would become *āu* by x.7; the *āu* would

7. *aḥsarvo visarjanīya* 'otvam' *bhājate 'kāraparah': aḥsarva ity akāreṇa sahe* 'ty arthaḥ. pre-----: sam-----: so----- *aḥsarva iti kim: samiddho añjann iti na sidhyet: kim tu vārṇasya vikāralopāv* (i.56) *iti visarjanīyamātrasya syād otvam: tata okārāukāraparah* (x.7) *ity āukāre kṛta āukāra āvan* (ix.15) *ity dvādeśaḥ: tathā satī<sup>3</sup> samiddhāv añjann iti syāt. 'yād vā':<sup>3</sup> svaraparo yakāram* (ix.10) *iti yatvam* '3

ix.10 (as pointed out in the comment to viii.5), rule 7 of this chapter ought to teach that "*visarjanīya*, when preceded by *a*, becomes *o* along with the latter, when *a* follows:" instead of which a new subject, "the whole syllable *ah*," is introduced there; and *visarjanīya*, being thus replaced by something else in rules 7 and 8, ought to drop out of view altogether, or, if needed further, to be distinctly specified over again. But we find it implied without specification in the present rule; and, farther, the being followed by a sonant consonant is brought down "by vicinage" from rule 8, while the *tu*, 'but,' the commentator says, merely annuls the being followed by *a*, as specified in rule 7. This is little less than absurd: if the sequence of *a* was to be annulled at all, it should have been so in rule 8—or, rather, it was annulled by rule 8, and needs to be made no further account of. The *tu* is here, as often elsewhere, a simple sign of a change of subject, and the commentator's attempt to give it a precise significance is—also, as often elsewhere—a failure. Our rule means, by its terms, that *ah*, *āh*, and *āśh* lose their *h* before a sonant consonant; only, as *ah* was already specially provided for by rule 8, it virtually applies only to *āh* and *āśh*. The statement is thus made more general than is needed for the case in hand, because the whole implication of "preceded by any *a*-vowel" is needed for rule 10, which is to teach that *ah*, *āh*, and *āśh* before a vowel—here, again, with the exception of *ah* before *a*, already provided for—convert their *h* into *y*, preliminary to dropping it altogether, by x.19. But rule 10 presents a more anomalous combination of two heterogeneous matters into one precept than is easily to be paralleled elsewhere in the *Prāticākhyā*. It is really made up of two independent parts: one, *atha svaraparāḥ*, 'Now then, when followed by a vowel,' which is an introductory heading having force through this chapter and the next; the other, *visarjanīyo yakāram*, '*h* becomes *y*,' and their combination is made in order that the implication of *visarjanīya* and also of *avarṇapūrva* may be made from what precedes, and may not require to be distinctly stated.

The commentator's examples of the application of the rule are *devā gātuvidāḥ* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>; 4.44<sup>3</sup>: vi.6.2<sup>3</sup>), and *vicityāḥ somāś na vicitryāś iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>; *somāś* for *somāśh*, by protraction from *somaḥ*: G. M. omit the last two words, O. the last three). He adds, as his exposition of the connection of the rule, that the express spe-

9. *avarṇapūrvō ghoshavatparas tu<sup>1</sup> visarjanīyo lupyate: hrasvapūrvasyādu<sup>2</sup> 'kāra<sup>3</sup> eva dīrghapūrvasya<sup>4</sup> phutapūrvasya ca lopāḥ. yathā: devā-----: viṣ----- okāram aḥ sarvo 'kāraparāḥ (ix.7) ity akāraparatvam pratyakṣam tuṣabdena nivartyā<sup>4</sup> "numānikam ghoshavatparatvam parigṛhyate sānnidhyāt: asyā<sup>4</sup> 'nūvartanam evā<sup>4</sup> 'bhāṣṭam atre<sup>4</sup> 'ti pūrvasātradvayasya<sup>4</sup> prthak-karaṇam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. ins. *saḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. *vīkāra*. <sup>3</sup> B. -*rva*; O. -*gha*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*trasya*.

Of which, then, the *y* is lost by x.19, leaving only *a*; and this, by x.25, is not liable to further combination. The commentator's examples are *ima' evā 'smāi* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *ta enam bhishajyanti* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>).

ओकारो ऽवम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. *O* becomes *av*.

The example is *vishnav e 'hī 'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>). For the further treatment of the *v* thus produced, see x.19 and the following rules.

नाकारपरी ॥ १३ ॥

13. But not, in either case, when followed by *a*.

The dual number of the attribute in this rule, we are told, sufficiently shows that the two letters *e* and *o*, last mentioned, are its subject. There are two different rules in the treatise applying to the case of a final *e* or *o* coming to stand before initial *a*—namely rule 11, above [or rule 12], and rule xi.1, which directs that the latter shall be elided—and, since the rules of this chapter are of paramount force, as preceding the other, the present precept is required in order to annul them.

The commentator's examples are *mā te 'asyām* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>), *samid-āho añjan* (v.1.11<sup>1</sup>), and *te 'bruvaṇ* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.).

ऐकार आयम् ॥ १४ ॥

14. *Āi* becomes *āy*.

11. <sup>1</sup>*visr̥shṭo visarjanīyah*. *idam*<sup>2</sup> *idanīm ucyate: svaraparāḥ padānta*<sup>3</sup> *ekaro 'yam itī vikāram āpadyate. ima-----: ta-----*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *visargo nivṛttaḥ*; O. *visargo vinirgataḥ*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. -*taḥ*; B. -*te*.

12. *svaparāḥ padānta okaro 'yam itī vikāram āpadyate. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *vish-----*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svarah*. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> W. B. G. M. om.

13. *dvivacanasāmāthyagr̥hītāv*<sup>1</sup> *ekārāṇukārāv akārāparāṇu*<sup>2</sup> *pūrvavidhīm*<sup>3</sup> *na prāpnutaḥ. yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *mā-----: sam-----: te-----: ity ādāv ekāro 'yam* (ix.11) <sup>5</sup> *lupyate tv akāra ekārāṇukārāparāvah* (xi.1) *itī*<sup>6</sup> *sātradvayam prasaktam: tatrā 'pi pūrvatvāt prabalan*<sup>7</sup> *yatvavidhīm nisheddhum ayam ārambhah. akārāḥ paro yābhyām tāv akārāparāṇu.*

<sup>1</sup> B. G. M. O. -*thyāt gr̥*-; and G. M. O. add *sannihītāv*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *pūrvā*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *itī ca*; O. ins. *itī*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ca*. <sup>7</sup> O. ins. *ekārasya*.

a consonant and preceding a vowel. Compare the similar rules in the other treatises (Rik Pr. ii.28; Vāj. Pr. iv.87; Ath. Pr. iii.36). The preceding precept being thus annulled with reference to these two cases, they fall under the general rule x.15, and the *u*, like any final, is converted into *v*. To show the bearing of the specification *sāmhitaḥ*, 'in combined text,' the commentator gives us the two passages in *pada* and *krama* form: thus—*tat: u: āhuh: tad u: uv āhuh: āhur utsriyam* (but G. M. O. give simply the first two *krama-pada*'s), and *tasmāt: u: āgyam: tasmād u: uv āgyam* (here only W. has the statement in *pada*). It thus appears that the combination with the preceding consonant is indispensable to the treatment of the *u* as here prescribed; failing that, it falls under the preceding rule, and becomes *uv*.

## ह्रस्वपूर्वो उकारो द्विवर्णम् ॥ १८ ॥

18. A *h*, when preceded by a short vowel, is doubled.

That is to say, when another vowel follows—the heading *atha svaraparah* (ix.10) still continuing in force. The commentator adds also "when occurring at the end of a *pada*," as he has done in his paraphrase of the preceding rules: this is a matter of course, as we are dealing only with the conversion of *pada*-text into *sāmhita*. His illustrative examples are *nyaññ agniḥ* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), and *tam u tvā dadhyaññ ṛshih* (iv.1.3<sup>2</sup> and v.1.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have the first two words). That the preceding vowel must be short, he shows by *parāñ ā vartate* (iii.2.9<sup>7</sup> and vi.3.8<sup>3</sup>); that a vowel must follow, by *sadrñk samānāñ syāt* (ii.2.8<sup>6</sup>: only O. has the last word; only B. G. M. have the inserted *k*, required by v.32, and G. M. convert it to *kh*, by xiv.12), and *pratyāñk shad-ahāḥ* (vii.4.2<sup>5</sup>: here all have the *k*, but only G. M. make it *kh*).

17. *tat tasmād ity' etābhyāñ sāmhita ukāro 'prktaḥ pūrvavi-dhīñ nā "pnoti": prakṛtyāvasthānanñ vakāraḥ ca na bhavati 'ty arthaḥ. tad..... tasmād..... ivarnokārāu yavakārāv* (x.15) *iti daḥame' 'sya' vidhir vakshyate'. tat tasmāt sāmhita iti kim: tat..... tasm-.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. "padyate"; O. *prāpn-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *-rāgamaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> O. *-ma*. <sup>5</sup> B. *tasya*. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. *tasya purastādapavādo 'yam*.

18. *'svaraparo ṇakārah padāntavartī hrasvapūrvō' dvivarnam 'bhajate. yathā': nyaññ..... tam..... hrasvapūrvā iti kim: par..... svarapara iti kim: sad..... praty..... hrasvaḥ pūrvō yasmād asdu hrasvapūrvāḥ: dvayor varṇayoḥ samāhāro dvivarnam.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. arrange *hr- sv- pad- ṇak-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. *dvivarn*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

As in other similar cases, the commentator, after his preliminary paraphrase of the rule, proceeds first to define the passages of the Sanhitā designated by the titles it contains. By *graha* is meant the fourth chapter of the first book, excepting its last four sections—or i.4.1–42. By *ukhya*, the first two chapters of the “Agni” book (see iii.9), excepting their final sections (which are *yājyā*)—or iv.1.1–10; 2.1–10. The *yājyās* have been already defined (iii.9, note), as the concluding sections of all the chapters to book fourth, chapter third, together with ii.6.11. By *prsthya* are intended nine sections, pointed out by the citation of the first words of each: they are iv.4.12; 6.6–9; 7.15: v.1.11; 2.11; 2.12. *Hiranyavarṇīya* designates only a single section, v.6.1. Examples are then given from each set of passages. From *graha* passages, we have *jahi çatrūñr apa mrdho nudasva* (i.iv.42), and *marutvāñ indra vṛshabhāḥ* (i.4.19: G. M. O. omit the last word): there are four other cases, at i.4.20 twice, 21.41. From *ukhya* passages, *ye vā vanaspatiñr anu* (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>), and *madhumāñ astu sūryaḥ* (iv.2.9<sup>3</sup>): there are ten others, at iv.1.3<sup>3</sup> twice, 9<sup>2,3</sup>, 10<sup>2,4</sup>; 2.4<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>1</sup>, 9<sup>5</sup> twice. From *yājyā* passages, *ṛtūñr ṛtupate yaje ’ha* (iv.3.13<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the last two words), to which W. B. O. add *amavāñ ibhena* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>); but for this G. M. substitute *madhumāñ indriyāvāñ* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>), which is not in a *yājyā* passage at all, but falls under the next rule: I have noted more than thirty other cases, namely at i.1.14<sup>4</sup>; 2.14<sup>2</sup>; 3.14<sup>8</sup>; 4.46<sup>2</sup>; 5.11<sup>2</sup>; 6.12<sup>4</sup>; 7.13<sup>4,5</sup>: ii.1.11<sup>5</sup> thrice; 2.12<sup>3,8</sup>; 3.14<sup>2,6</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup> thrice <sup>4</sup> twice, 12<sup>1,3</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup> thrice, <sup>7</sup>; 2.11<sup>3</sup> twice; 4.11<sup>8</sup>; 5.11<sup>2</sup>: iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>; 3.13<sup>2,3,4</sup> twice. The same passages contain five exceptions, which are duly provided for in rules 23 and 24, below. From *prsthya* passages, the examples are *çatrūñr anapavyayantāḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>) and *jaghanāñr upa jighmate* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>): other cases at iv.6.7<sup>5</sup>, 9<sup>4</sup> twice; 7.15<sup>7</sup>: v.1.11<sup>4</sup>. Finally,

*kān’ varjayitvā ’dāde grāvā’ (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>) iti praçnaḥ: agnikāṇḍa-  
syā ’dyam praçnadvayam uttamānuvākaavarjam ukhyam’ ākhyā-  
yate: ukta yājyāḥ: samid diçām (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>) jīmūtasya  
(iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>) yad akrandāḥ (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>) mā no mitraḥ (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>) ye  
vājinam (iv.6.9<sup>1</sup>) agner manve (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>) samiddho añjan  
(v.1.11<sup>1</sup>) gāyatrī (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). kas tvā (v.2.12<sup>1</sup>) ity anuvākanava-  
kam’ prsththya iti pathyate: hiranyavarṇāḥ (v.6.1<sup>1</sup>) ity  
anuvāko hiranyavarṇīyaḥ. ’grāhe yaṭhā:’ jahi-----: mar-----  
ukhye: ye-----: madh-----: yājyāsu: ṛtūñr-----: ama-----  
prsththye: çatr-----: jagh-----: hiranyavarṇīye: agnīñr-----:  
sarv-----: anitipara iti kim: abhy-----: iḍā-----: grahādi-  
shv iti kim: trīn-----: paçān-----: tān-----.*

*itih paro yasmād asāv itiparaḥ: ne ’tiparo ’nitiparaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. read *grh-* throughout. <sup>2</sup> B. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *ity etasmād anyasvar-*; B. *iti ’ty etad asmad anyas-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *’ntyānuv-*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-vā ’si*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *ins. ity*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *anuvākāḥ*. <sup>8</sup> W. O. *pachyate*; G. M. *pathyanie*. <sup>(9)</sup> G. M. om.

the *ut* before *ayān* needed to be quoted along with it. For *amṛtān*, *ud asthām amṛtān anu* (i.2.8<sup>1</sup>). For *ḍuryān*, *bhadrān ḍuryān abhy e'hi mām anuvratā ny u* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *mām* etc.): there are two other cases, at i.2.13<sup>1</sup>: vi.2.9<sup>1</sup>; and a single exception, *pra carā soma ḍuryān adityāh* (i.2.10<sup>1</sup>), quoted by the commentator in justification of the restriction "not preceded by *soma*." For *asmān*, so *asmān adhipatīn karotu* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.2.7<sup>2</sup>): another example is at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>; and *asmān* becomes *asmāñ* also at i.6.12<sup>4</sup>, but in virtue of the preceding rule. The counter-example, showing the necessity of prefixing *so* in the rule, is *indro asmān asmin dvitīye* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit the last word). For *avimān*, *avimāñ acvī* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>: but the last case falls under the preceding rule also). For *gomān*, *gomāñ agne* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup>; 7.6<sup>7</sup>: iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>—that is to say, in the same phrase with *avimān*). For *madhumān*, *madhumāñ indriyāvān* (iii.1.10<sup>2</sup>). Next follows a counter-example, intended to show why *mān* would not have been enough of itself to include the last three words, without the prefixed parts *avi*, *go*, and *madhu*: it is *paçumān eva bhavati* (vi.2.6<sup>2</sup> et al.). Then, for *havishmān*, *havishmāñ ā vivāṣati* (i.3.12): the word occurs a second time in the same section, and also at vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>. For *hūtamān*, *devahūtamāñ ity ukhāyām juhōti* (v.5.3<sup>1</sup>: W. B. omit the last word): it is found again, in like form, in the succeeding division of the section. The specification "before any vowel belonging to the text (*ārshe*, 'coming from the *ṛshis*')," is declared to be meant as an annulment of the restriction, "except before *iti*," made in the preceding rule. And, to show that the *n* remains unchanged before a vowel not forming part of the fundamental text, is given the *pada*-reading *devahūtamān iti deva-hūtamān*. There is added further a remark which looks like a gloss that has worked its way into the text: "the specification 'before what comes from the *ṛshis*' has force in both directions, after the fashion of the crow's eye [Molesworth says, the crow is regarded as having a single eye, which shifts from one eye-

*pare*<sup>11</sup> *yatvam āpadyate*<sup>12</sup>: *dev*----: *ārsha iti kim*: *dev*----:  
<sup>13</sup> *ārshagrahaṇasāmārthyād itiparatve*<sup>14</sup> 'pi<sup>15</sup> *yatvam bhavati*: *ārsha iti kākākshivād*<sup>16</sup> *ubhayatra sambadhyate grahokhyādima-*  
*hānparyantam*<sup>17</sup>: *ārshasvayampātha*<sup>18</sup> *ity arthah. cikiti*----:  
*iḍāv*----: *kak*----: *viç*----: *iḍākakshibāne*<sup>19</sup> 'ti *kim*: *ras*----:  
*sam*----: *hī*'ti *kim*: *ārj*----: *ārsha itiparatvād dev*----:  
*itivād yatvaprāptir higrāhaṇena nishidhyate*<sup>20</sup>. *stuto*----: *su*  
*vid*----: *amit*----: *arāñ*----: *posh*----: *agne*----

<sup>1</sup> For *asomapūrvah*, G. M. read *ity esha nakāras somapūrvō 'nusvāran nā* "pad-yate"; B. O. *nā som*-, as do T. G. M. in the rule itself. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. *eshu*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yatvam bhajate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. *ayam*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vidhān*. <sup>6</sup> W. *sarvo 'rtho*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. *iti*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *dvitvan*. <sup>9</sup> W. O. *avimādhv*. <sup>10</sup> W. adds *cikivān*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *ārshasvaraparō*. <sup>12</sup> W. *nāpadyate*; B. *bhavati*; G. M. O. *bhajate*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. -*pare*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. ins. *hūtamān ity ukhāyām ity atra*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *kākāsh-*; G. M. -*kshinyāyena*. <sup>17</sup> W. B. om. *māhān*. <sup>18</sup> B. *ārshaḥ sv-*; G. M. *ārshabhāvan*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *iḍādiviçeshena*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. O. *pratiçh-*.

The implication here, the commentator tells us, is of a *n* preceded by *ā* only: he does not explain why, but would have a right to appeal to the mention of *ān* last in rule 20, and the exclusion of any other cases than those of a final *ān* in rule 21. His examples are as follows. For *indro me, sapatnāñ indro me* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.3<sup>4</sup>); with a counter-example, *yushmān indro 'vrñta* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>), to illustrate the need of specifying *me*. For *akah, nigrābhenā 'dharāñ akah* (i.1.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.4<sup>2</sup>: iv.6.3<sup>4</sup>: that is to say, in the same passage as the preceding: O. omits the first word). For *ādhwam, yāyam devāñ ādhwam* (i.3.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the first word). For *iḥā, agne devāñ iḥā "vaha* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>; 5.5<sup>3</sup>: iv.6.1<sup>3</sup>); with a counter-example, *yajñiyan iha yān havāmahe* (i.5.10<sup>3</sup>: only W. has the last word), to show that the *nimitta* in this case is *iḥā*, not *iha*. For *apy etu, gharma devāñ apy etu* (i.5.10<sup>4</sup>: B. omits *gharmah*: again at i.6.3<sup>2</sup>); with the counter-example, *vidvān api janyeshu* (vi.1.6<sup>6</sup>), to show that *api* without *etu* does not cause the conversion. For *aganma, suvar devāñ aganma* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>). For *idenyān, idāmahāi devāñ idenyān* (ii.5.9<sup>6</sup>). For *āyajishthah, devāñ āyajishthah svasti* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>; 6.1<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word). For *ā ca, devāñ ā ca vakshat* (iv.6.3<sup>4</sup> twice, and v.4.6<sup>6</sup> twice); but this example is omitted by G. M., and they also omit the item *ā ca* in the rule itself. A counter-example, *yān ā vaha uçatah* (i.4.44<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), is given by all but O.: in G. M., it should show that *ā* causes *āñ* only when followed by *yajishthah*; in W., only by *yajishthah* and *ca*; but W. states the occasion for it in the same manner as G. M., and B. alone sets it in its proper relation to both the foregoing examples. For *rtu*, the example is, in W. B., *vājo devāñ rtubhih* (iv.7.12<sup>2</sup>), but G. M. O. give instead *yebhir devāñ rtubhih* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>): I have found no other case. For *akurvata, vittvā kāmāñ akurvata* (i.5.9<sup>3</sup>). For *aduhāt, yajño 'surāñ aduhāt* (i.7.1<sup>1</sup>). For *aditih, vivasvāñ aditih* (i.5.3<sup>2</sup>). For *agre, agnis tāñ agre* (iii.1.4<sup>2</sup>): we have also *vāyus tāñ agre* in the same division. For *adharān, anyāñ adharānt sapatnān* (iii.2.8<sup>5</sup>); with a counter-example, *bhrātrvyān adharān pādāyāmi* (iii.5.3<sup>1</sup>). For *alam, purodāçāñ alam kurv iti* (vi.3.1<sup>2</sup>). Finally, to show that the rule applies only to *ān*, *paridhān akurvata* (vi.2.1<sup>5-6</sup>).

The comment closes with an exposition which I must confess that I do not fully understand. It is evidently intended to determine the readings which the words treated in these rules shall have in *jatā*-text; and it furnishes abundant illustrations, in reference to the form of which, however, there is not a little difference between the different recensions: G. M. O. generally citing the passage first

*yajñ-..... ghar-..... etv iti kim: vidvān-..... suvar-.....  
iḥā-..... devāñ-..... 'devāñ-..... 'yajishthah ce 'ti kim: yān  
..... vājo-..... vit-..... yajño-..... vivas-..... agnis-.....  
anyāñ-..... sapatnān iti kim: bhrā-..... puro-..... anvāde-  
çah kimarthah: pari-..... tattatpadagrahane kartavye parapa-  
dagrahaṇam 'anārshē 'pi<sup>5</sup> saṁhītāvidhāv<sup>6</sup> agraḥaṇasya<sup>7</sup> ca<sup>8</sup> ya-*

out by means of the quotation of the following word *adharān* (which is itself, therefore, *nāimittika*, while *adharān* is *grahana*; or which is *grahana-nāimittika*, 'undergoing a prescribed effect under the influence of a quoted word'), and which one might suppose changeable only before that word. It is in accordance with this latter explanation that the last two pairs of examples are taken, the one from under rule 21, the other from under rule 22. At any rate, the general conclusion appears to be pretty well assured, that a word which shows a final *ñ* in *samhitā* shows it also in *jaṭā* before a following vowel of whatever kind. This is markedly different from its treatment in *pada*, where, by the initial specification of rule 20, its power of conversion to *ñ* is lost altogether: and even in *jaṭā* (as was shown in the note to iii.1), an altered letter usually exhibits its *samhitā* form only under the specific circumstances which condition that form in *samhitā*-text.

न रश्मीत्कूपयान्यमान्यतङ्गात्समानानर्चान्यजीयान्॥२३॥

23. The *n* of *raçmîn*, *çrapayān*, *yamān*, *patañgān*, *samānān*, *arcān*, *yajīyān* remains unchanged.

All these are words occurring in the passages respecting which the comprehensive prescription of rule 20 was made; needing, therefore, to be specifically exempted from its action. The commentator quotes the phrases in which they occur, as follows: *pu-rutrā ca raçmîn anu* (iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>), *aditiḥ çrapayān iti* (iv.1.5<sup>4</sup>), *su-yamān ātaye* (iv.7.15<sup>4,5</sup>), *patañgān asamāditāḥ* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), *samānān samānān uçann agne* (iv.3.13<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the first word), *arcān indra grāvānaḥ* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: G. M. have dropped out all but *arcā*), and *yajīyān upasthe mātuḥ* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word). The first two are from *ukhya* passages, the third from a *prsthya*, the rest from *yājyā*—as is noted also by the commentator (but G. M. omit these notices, save the first). Under the second, he further suggests the objection that, as the word following *çrapayān* is *iti*, the case might seem not to fall under the rule (since this expressly says "except before *iti*"); but he urges in reply that the word *ārshē* in rule 21 (that is to say, of course, according to his

23. <sup>1</sup>----- *eteshu*<sup>1</sup> *grahaneshu* *nakāraḥ svaraparo* <sup>2</sup>*pi na kha-lu repam yakdraṁ*<sup>2</sup> *vā bhajate. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *purv*-----: *adi*-----: *ukhyatvād anayoḥ prāptiḥ*<sup>4</sup>. *nanv adi*-----: *asye*<sup>5</sup> <sup>6</sup>*tiparatvād eva nishedhe sati grahanam anartham*<sup>6</sup>: *iti cet: ārsha itiparatvāt punaḥ prāptiḥ: tan mā bhūd iti brāmaḥ. su-y*-----: <sup>7</sup>*prsthya*<sup>7</sup>*tvat prāptiḥ*<sup>8</sup>: *patañ*-----: <sup>9</sup>*yājyātvāt*<sup>10</sup> *prāptiḥ*<sup>9</sup>: *sama*-----: *arcān*-----: *yajī*-----: <sup>11</sup>*eshām api sūi*<sup>11</sup> *va prāptiḥ*<sup>11</sup>.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *raçmîn ity ādīshu*; O. *eshu* for *eteshu*. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. *vā yatvam*. (<sup>3</sup>) B. *tathā*; the rest om. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. *-ptinishedhaḥ*. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. *atra*. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. O. *-thakam*. (<sup>7</sup>) O. om. *iti*. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>10</sup>) O. ins. *asya*. (<sup>11</sup>) G. M. om.



treatment; and it appears to be laid down that any word has in that text the same form as under analogous circumstances in *saṁhitā*, whether it fall under an exception or under a rule. Then, as example of an exceptional word, is given, as established by the present precept, *amitrān ud ud amitrān amitrān ut* (iv.1.10<sup>a</sup>), *amitrān* retaining its *n* throughout; and again, as examples falling under the more general rule, *so asmān asmānt sa so asmān: asmān avahāyā 'vahāyā 'smān asmān avahāyā* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>: under rule 21).

So far, now, as I have been able to discover, the teachings of the *Prātiśākhya* in rules 20–24 of this chapter precisely correspond with the conditions of the known *Tāittirīya* text: I have not found in the latter a single case of final *ān*, *īn*, *ūn* which they do not duly notice, nor an exception to the more general rules which is not provided for. Of course, my observation is more to be trusted upon the former point than upon the latter.

The *sandhi* here treated of is comparatively unusual in our *Sanhitā*, as it is in those of the other Vedas. According to my count, there are (including repetitions) 115 cases of *ān* (including also one at iv.6.6<sup>7</sup>, omitted above), 5 of *īn*, and 4 of *ūn*—in all, 124; while, of final *ān* remaining unchanged before a vowel, I have noted down over 450 instances (and probably not without overlooking a score or two), of *ūn*, about 150, of *īn*, 16, and of *īn*, 4—in all, about 620, or not less than five times as many. The numerical relation in the *Atharva-Veda* is probably nearly the same. See the end of the note to *Ath. Pr.* ii.27.

## CHAPTER X.

CONTENTS: 1–9, combination of final and initial similar vowels, and of final *a* or *ā* with initial vowels and diphthongs; 10–12, resulting accentuation and nasalization; 13, special cases of uncombinable final *ā*; 14, of elision of final *a*, *ā* before initial *e* and *o*; 15–17, combination of final *i* and *u* vowels, and resulting accentuation; 18, special cases of uncombinable final *i*; 19–23, elision of final *y* and *v*; 24–25, uncombinable final vowels.

### अथैकमुभे ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the coalescence of two vowels into one.

An introductory heading to the whole chapter. The commentator paraphrases: “both syllables become one form, of the same kind.”

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ubhe akshare ekaṁ rūpam sajā-tīyam<sup>1</sup> āpadyete<sup>2</sup> ity etad adhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyāmah.*

<sup>1</sup> O. puts before *rūpam*. <sup>2</sup> MSS. -yata.

ti (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: W. reads *neshtu*); and O. alone adds *mahendrāya* (v.5.21; p. *mahā-indrāya*).

## उवर्णपर ओकारम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. When an *u*-vowel follows, the product is *o*.

The commentator's single illustrative example is *ishe tvo* "rje *tvā* (i.1.1).

## एकारिकारपर ऐकारम् ॥ ६ ॥

6. When *e* or *ai* follows, the product is *ai*.

The examples are *sam brahmaṇā prcyasvāi 'katāya svāhā* (i.1.8: O. omits the last word), and *somāindrā babhrulādmāh* (v.6.15; p. *soma-dindrah*).

The commentator again very elaborately explains *ekārāikārapare* as a *karmadhāraya* compound, formed upon *ekārāikāra* as a *dvandva*; and remarks that the same explanation applies also in the following rule.

## ओकारौकारपर औकारम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. When *o* or *au* follows, the product is *au*.

The examples are *brahmāudanam pacati* (not found in the *Tāit*.

4. *avarṇapūrva ivarṇapare ca sati* <sup>1</sup> *te* <sup>2</sup> *ubhe akshare ekāram āpnutaḥ. ne 'sh-----: mah. ivarṇaḥ cā 'sau 'paraḥ ce 'varṇa-parah*<sup>3</sup>: *tasmin*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ubhe akshare.* <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> B. *pūrvaḥ ca avarṇapūrvaḥ.*

5. *avarṇapūrva uvarṇapare ca sati* *te*<sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare*<sup>2</sup> *okāram āpnutaḥ. ishe-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

6. *avarṇapūrva ekārāikārapare ca sati* *te*<sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare*<sup>2</sup> *pūrvāparibhāte*<sup>3</sup> *āikāram āpnutaḥ. sam-----: som-----: ekāraḥ cāi 'kāraḥ cāi 'kārāikārau: tayoh samāhāra ekārāikāram: 'samāhāre dvandvaḥ*<sup>4</sup>: *tac ca tatparam cāi 'kārāikāraparam karma-dhārayaḥ: tasminn ekārāikārapare*<sup>5</sup>. *evam 'uparitan.e 'pi sūtre samāsaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *pūrvāpare*, and put before *akshare*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>(5)</sup> O. *-tanasūtre 'pi*.

7. *avarṇapūrva okārāukārapare ca sati* *te*<sup>1</sup> *ubhe akshare*<sup>2</sup> *aukāram āpnutaḥ. brah-----: dām-----*<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. add *uktas samāsaḥ*.

## उदात्तमुदात्तवति ॥ १० ॥

10. When an acute enters into the combination, the result is acute.

That is to say, as the commentator points out, when the first constituent, or the second constituent, or both constituents, have the *udatta* accent, their combination is *udatta*. He gives a long list of examples in illustration of the working of the rule, promising that they shall exhibit the whole series of vowel-combinations just prescribed, from the second rule to the ninth, with all possible conditions of accentual combination. Thus, *savitā' prā' rpayati.* (i.1.1; p. *prā:* *arp:* W. reads *-yati*) *brāhma yachā' 'pā' gne* (i.1.7; p. *yacha;* *āpa*), *yājyā'i* " *'vā'i 'nam* (ii.3.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *yājyā: ā:* *evā:* *enam:* the pada-manuscripts have *ē 'ti* for *ā'*; and so with the other prepositions), *pāshā' " 'dhatta* (i.5.1<sup>2</sup>; p. *pāshā: ā:* *adhatta:* W. B. read *-tte*), *divi' 'va cākshuh* (i.3.6<sup>2</sup> and iv.2.9<sup>4</sup>; p. *divi:* *iva:* for this accent, which is opposed to the teachings of all the other Prāṭiśākhyas, see under rule 17 of the present chapter), *adyā vāsu vasati' 'ti' 'ndro hi devā'ndam* (ii.5.3<sup>7</sup>; p. *vasati:* *iti:* *indrah:* O. reads at the end *'ndram eva*, which I do not find anywhere in the Sanhitā), *māitradvarun' 'ty āha* (ii.6.7<sup>4</sup>; p. *ānu:* *ūt:* only G. M. have *tān*), and *tā' dikshā' 'pā' 'dadhata* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>; p. *dikshā:* *ūpa:* G. M. omit *tā*). So many are examples of the combination of two similar simple vowels into a long vowel: the rest illustrate the cases of coalescence in which *a* or *ā* precedes. They are *sē 'mām no havyādā-*

*ca sati te' ubhe akshare' āram iti vikāram āpnutah. upā-----*  
*rt----- avarnāntopasargaviśeshanena' kim: vyṛ----- upasar-*  
*gaṣ cā 'śhu pūrvaṣ co 'pasargapūrvaḥ: tasminn' upasargapūrve'.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. om. *anu.* <sup>2</sup> W. *viśeshavar:*; B. *viśeshoktā yathā;* G. M. *aviśeshokto* 'pi; O. *aviśeshāktāu api.* <sup>3</sup> O. om. *ayam.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *upas;* G. M. B. *-sheṇa.* <sup>7</sup> B. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om.

10. *udāttadharmaviśiṣṭe varṇe pūrvataḥ parata ubhayato vā sthite sati te ubhe apy ekādeṣam āpanne' udāttadharmakam' āpnutah. udātto 'syā' stī 'ty udāttavān: tasminn udāttavati. samānāksharam ārabhya sarvasmād' ekibhāve 'yathākramam udāt-tānudāttasavaritapūrva ubhayor udātte vo' 'dāharaṇāni darçayishydmah'. sav-----: brah-----: yāj-----: pūsh-----: div-----: adya-----: māt-----: nanu sūnnīyam ity atro 'dātte nādi 'kādeṣe sati kim na syād ayam vidhiḥ: udāttapūrvādhikāre*

opinion of some authorities that nasal simple vowels, not *pragrahas*, are nasal; and he states that the present precept has reference to them: if such a nasal vowel, being acute, enters into a combination of the kind above described, the resulting single syllable is nasal. Examples, he says, are those already given. And he adds that the rule is not approved.

I cannot at all believe this to be the true interpretation. The rule seems, on the other hand, to belong to and represent the same view of the nature of a syllable ordinarily regarded as containing *anusvāra*, which appears so unequivocally at xv.1; and to mean that when such a syllable, being looked upon as one containing a nasal vowel, instead of a vowel with succeeding *anusvāra*, enters into combination with another vowel (of course, a preceding one), the result is also nasal. Thus, for example, *yah* with *aṅgum* would make *yo* 'ñcum; *svāhā* and *aṅsābhyām* (vii.3.16<sup>1-2</sup>), *svāhā* 'ñsābhyām.

## स्वरितानुदात्तसंनिपाते स्वरितम् ॥ १२ ॥

12. When circumflex and grave are combined, the result is circumflex.

The examples of this accentual result of combination, as given by the commentator, are as follows: *kanyā* 'va *tunnā*' (iii.1.11<sup>3</sup>; p. *kanyā*: *iva*), *chavī'm chavyā* 'pā'kr̥tāya *svā'hā* (v.7.20; p. *chavyā*: *upa-d'kr̥tāya*: G. M. O. omit *svā'hā*), *yājyāi* 'shā' *vā'i sap-tāpādā cakvārī* (ii.6.2<sup>6</sup>; p. *yājyā*: *eshā*: G. M. O. end with 'shā'), and *ātha kvā* 'syā *havanī'ya iti* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>; p. *kvā*: *asyāh*: O. omits the last two words). He then goes on to point out that the word *svarita*, 'circumflex,' being used in the rule without any distinctive sign, we are to understand the "constant" (*nitya*) or "independent" circumflex (see rule xx.2) to be intended. For this alone arises at the time of production of letters and syllables, elements of words; but the other kinds of circumflex arise after the time of origin of words, in connection with the euphonic combination of

11. *apragrahāḥ samānākṣharāṇy anunāsikāṇy' ekeshām*<sup>2</sup> (xv.6) *ity ekeshām<sup>3</sup> matam: tān udḍigya<sup>4</sup> 'yam vidhih. tas-minn<sup>4</sup> udāttavaty anunāsike pārvataḥ parata ubhayato vā sthite saty<sup>5</sup> ubhe<sup>6</sup> akṣhare anunāsikadharmam ekam āpṛutaḥ. uktāny eva 'dāharāṇāni.*

'etad anisṭam.'

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *yeshām*; B. *eshām*. <sup>4</sup> W. *tasmād*. G. M. O. ins. *te*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. ins. *apy*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *ne 'dam sūtram isṭam*.

12. *svaritānudaṭṭayoh samnipāta ekādeṣe saty ubhāv api tāu svaritam āpadyete<sup>1</sup>. yathā<sup>2</sup>: kan-----: chav-----: yāj-----: atha----- iha svaritasya<sup>3</sup> 'viçeṣeṇa<sup>4</sup> grahane nityasvarita eva<sup>5</sup> grhyate: tasya svaritasya<sup>6</sup> vyañjanānām akṣharānām ca<sup>7</sup> padā-*

'*ti* *sva-dhā* (only W. has *sva-dhā* in the repetition), *prame* '*ti* *pramā*, *prape* '*ti* *prapā* (O. omits the readings of *pramā* and *prapā*). Further, to explain the final specification *ārshē*, 'before a vowel belonging to the text,' W. gives next the *jaṭā* readings of *svadhā asi* and *prapā asi*, namely *svadhā asy asi svadhā svadhā asi*, and *prapā asy asi prapā prapā asi*; O. has only the former, and substitutes for the latter *dhruvā 'si dharunā* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>; 3.7<sup>2</sup>), which would be in place as a counter-example showing that other words than those specified in the rule are not treated as it prescribes before *asi*, but is not introduced as such, and does not make its appearance at all in the other versions; B. also has only the former (reading at the end *svadhā 'si*), and adds *evam ddi*, 'and so on.' G. M. give no *jaṭā*-readings at all here, but pass directly from the *pada*-readings to the quotations illustrating the remaining words of the rule, namely: *pra budhniyā irate* (iv.3.13<sup>6</sup>: G. M. omit *pra*); *dhanvañ jyā iyam* (iv.6.6<sup>1-2</sup>: only G. M. have the first word); *ā pūshā etv ā vasu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, *tam pūshā 'dhatta* (i.5.1<sup>2</sup>), to show that *pūshā* after any other word than *ā* is not uncombinable; and *ā te suparnā aminanta evāih* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the first two words, O. the first three). Now the question is asked again, "why is it said, 'when a vowel from the text follows?'" and W. B. O., having settled the point already so far as *dhā*, *mā*, and *pā* were concerned, reply by quoting the *jaṭā*-readings of the other four words, each with its successor, thus: *budhniyā irata irate budhniyā budhniyā irate* (but B. reads *budhniye* "rate, and O. *budhnye* "rate, the last time), *jyā iyam iyañ jyā jyā iyam* (B. O. again have *jye* 'yam at the end), *pūshā etv etu pūshā pūshā etu* (B. O. again *pūshāi* 'tu in the third repetition), and *aminanta evāir evāir aminantā 'minanta evāih* (B. O. once more *aminantāi* 'vāih to close with). G. M., however, who have the application of *ārshē* in the first part of the rule still to illustrate, give us here a most liberal series of extracts from the *jaṭā*-text: first, for *asi svadhā* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup> or ii.6.4<sup>4</sup>), namely *asi svadhā svadhā asy asi svadhā*; then for *svadhā asi*, as set down above (with *svadhā 'si* at the end, like B.; but it seems a merely accidental coincidence, for in all the other cases the third pair of words reads like the first, with the hiatus); for *iva prapā*, *iva prapā prapā 've 'va prapā*; for *prapā asi*, as above reported from W.; for *pra budhniyā*; for *budhniyā irate*, as in W.; for *dhanvañ jyā*; for *jyā iyam*, as in W.; for *ā pūshā*, *ā pūshā pūshā* " " *pūshā*; for *pūshā etu*, as in W.; for *suparnā aminanta*, *suparnā aminantā 'minanta suparnā suparnā aminanta*; and for *aminanta evāih*, as in W. From all this illustration, we seem authorized to draw the inference that the words mentioned in the rule as having

13. *dhā: mā: pā: 'eteshv' antyasvara ārshē' pāthe' 'siparah: budhniyā: jyā: ā pūshā: aminanta: eteshv' antyasvara ārshē' svaraparāh pārvavidhiṃ na prāpnoti. yathā': sv-a-----: sah-----: dhan-----: asipara iti kim: sv-a-----: 'pra-----: pra-*

same two cases were given by him in illustration of the previous rule (see note to i.22). As general counter-examples, to prove the implication of "an *a*-vowel," we have *cityoshtāḥ citibhruḥ* (v.6.14), and *cityoshthāya svāhā* (vii.3.17).

इवर्णोकारौ यवकारौ ॥ १५ ॥

15. An *i*-vowel and *u* become respectively *y* and *v*.

Here, the commentator tells us, the implication "preceded by an *a*-vowel" ceases, but the implication "followed by a vowel" has force—which implication comes all the way from rule 10 of the preceding chapter. The rule says *ukāra*, 'short *u*,' instead of *uvarṇa*, 'an *u*-vowel,' because long *ū* has already (by iv 5) been declared *pragraha*, and protracted *ūs* is made uncombinable below (by x.24). The examples are *abhy asthāt* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>), *ūty acyāma* (i.3.14<sup>3</sup>), and *ā pūshā etv ā vasu* (ii.4.5<sup>1</sup>).

उदात्तयोश्च परो ञ्नुदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ १६ ॥

16. And, when they are acute, a following grave becomes circumflex.

The word "and" (*ca*), we are told, brings down from the preceding rule the "*i*-vowel and *u*," there described as suffering a certain effect. The examples given of the production of this kind of circumflex accent, later (xx.1) described as the *kṣhāḍipra*, are *vy evā'i 'nena pāri dhatte* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words), and *apsv āgne* (iv.2.11<sup>3</sup>). As counter-examples, we have first *nīcā' tām dhakshy atasām* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>) and *mādhv agnā'u juhōti* (ii.3.2<sup>3</sup>), to show that unless the converted vowels are acute, no circumflex appears; and then, to prove that the following vowel must also be grave, *tād yād rey ādhy akshārāni* (ii.4.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the first word), *sā tv 'ā'i yajeta* (ii.6.6<sup>3</sup> et al.: G. M. omit this whole example), and *in nv 'ā' ūpastīrnam ichānti* (i.6.7<sup>3</sup>):

*sya grahaṇam bhavati grahaṇasya ca* (i.22) *iti vacant:* *upay-----: nir-----* 'avarṇo lupyata' *iti kim:* *city-----: city-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*ṇapūrvo*. <sup>2</sup> W. -*īamānināḍ*; G. M. -*īamānāḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *avarṇapūrva*.  
(<sup>4</sup>) B. -*ṇapūrvo l*; O. -*ṇalopa*; G. M. -*ṇapūrva*.

15. *avarṇapūrvādhikāro nivṛttaḥ: svaraparādhikāras tu var-tate: atha svaraparo yakāram* (ix.10) *iti pūrvādhyaḍye prakrāntaḥ. ivarṇokārāu padāntāu' svaraparāu yathāsamkhyena' yavakārāv āpadyete. abhy-----: ūty-----: ā pū-----* *dirgha-sya pragrahavidhānt phutasya sanidhinishēdhād ukārasya kārot-taratvam' kṛtam: ivarṇokārāu yavakārāv iti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. puts after the next word. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*khyam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vakār*.

noted about thirty cases in the *Tāttirīya* text (examples, one in each book, are i.3.6<sup>2</sup>: ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>: iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>: iv.1.6<sup>2</sup>: v.1.7<sup>2</sup>: vi.1.1<sup>6</sup>: vii.5.7<sup>4</sup>); the accentuation is throughout acute, as we should expect.

## न श्येती मियुनी ॥ १८ ॥

18. Exceptions are *cyeti* and *mithunī*.

That is to say, these words are exceptions to rule 15—and, being thus exempt from the conversion there prescribed, and there being no other rule requiring their alteration, they remain unchanged, as if they were *pragrahas*. The examples are *cyāitena cyeti akuruta* (v.5.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first word; *cyeti* occurs also in the next division of the same section, though not before a vowel), and *na mithunī abhavan* (v.3.6<sup>2</sup>: B. omits *na*). The latter word is found in two other places—at iii.4.9<sup>1</sup> and vi.5.8<sup>6</sup>—exhibiting the same uncombinable quality; and in the latter place it has been made (at iv.53) the subject of special exception as not a *pragraha*. The *pada*-text, in fact, writes both words as if no peculiar character belonged to them.

## लुप्येते त्वर्णपूर्वौ यवकारौ ॥ १९ ॥

19. But *y* and *v* are elided, when preceded by an *a*-vowel.

The word “but” (*tu*) in this rule, the commentator says, annuls the application of the rule to any other *y* and *v* than such as are the products of prescribed euphonic processes, and makes these alone the subjects of its action. As a *y* or *v* can never occur as final except by euphonic conversion, the particle has no very useful office to fill, according to the interpretation. Evidently enough, it is used here, as elsewhere in the treatise where a specific force is sought for it by the comment, simply as indicative of a sudden change of subject.

Vastly the largest class of cases falling under the rule is that in which, by ix.10, a *visarjanīya* has been converted into *y* after *a*, *ā*, *āḥ* before another vowel than *a*. In illustration of this class, the commentator quotes *āpa undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>), *dhruvā asmin gopatāu* (i.1.1: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *na vicinityāḥ iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>). The next class consists of cases of final *e* and *āi*, converted into *ay* and *āy* by ix.11,14: the examples are *ima evā 'smāi* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>), and *āsāmahā eve 'māu* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>). Yet another class embraces the endings in *ān* of which the *n* was turned to *y* (with nasalization of the *ā*, or with *anusvāra* added, by xv.1–3) according to the rules at the end of the last chapter (ix.20–24): the selected example is *martyāñ dvivega* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>). But the rule teaches also the

18. *cyeti*: *mithunī*: *ity etayor antyasvaro yathāvihitam<sup>1</sup> ya-tvam nā<sup>2</sup> padhyate. yathā<sup>2</sup>: cyāi-----: na-----*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> W. G. M. O. om.

W. B. omit this example; O. puts it after the other one, and leaves off *durone*, and *ahāv anadātā hate* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *hate*).

This is rather the most striking example afforded us of the over-riding by the commentary of the obvious intent of the Prāṭiśākhya itself. The usage of the existing Tāittirīya text is on the side of the comment: we have a similar resolution of the final *a* of vocatives into *av*, with retention of the *v*, at i.2.13<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.39; 6.12<sup>3</sup>: ii.2.12<sup>4,8</sup>; 4.12<sup>3</sup>; 6.11<sup>1</sup>: iii.2.10<sup>1</sup>: vi.4.3<sup>3</sup>. Of *āv* as result of final *āu* before a vowel, I have failed to collect the examples; but had there been any cases of the omission of the *v*, I think I should not have omitted to observe and note them.

## उकारौकारपरौ लुप्येते माचाकीयस्य ॥२२॥

22. According to Mācākīya, both are omitted when followed by *u* or *o*.

Instead of Mācākīya, the southern manuscripts have, both in the rule and in the commentary, Māyikāya.

All the manuscripts of the commentary declare that "respectively" (*yathāsamkhyam*) is to be understood in the rule—that is to say, that it directs us to drop *y* before *u*, and *v* before *o*; but their examples do not support this interpretation, and it is palpably a false one. It is difficult to believe that the rule itself is not corrupted, and that it ought not to read *ukārāukāraparo lupyate*, 'v is dropped before *u* or *o*' (it does not occur in the text before *ū*); for, while we can discover no phonetic reason for the omission of *y* before a labial vowel, there is a very obvious difficulty in the utterance of *v* (*w*) before *u* (no real Sanskrit word begins with *vu*, nor can I recall it in the interior of a word except as the rare result of *sandhi*); and, as thus amended, Mācākīya's view would accord with the accepted doctrine of the Rik Prāt. (ii.9–11), and with one mentioned, though not adopted, by the Vāj. Pr. (iv.125).

The illustrative examples given are in part those which have appeared already, even more than once, under the preceding rules:

21. *sāmnidhyān nishedho labhyate. sāmkr̥tyasya mate 'varṇa-pārvo vakāro na lupyate: yakāras tu lupyata eve 'ty arthaḥ. 'vāy-----' ahāv----- pūrvacāryamatanivartakas tuṣabdhā.*

*sūtram idam eve 'śṣṭam: na tu pūrvadvayam<sup>2</sup> paradvayam<sup>3</sup> ca.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. B. om.; O. puts after the other example. <sup>2</sup> O. *pūrvasūtrā-*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om.

22. *yakāravakārdv avarṇapārvāv ukārāukāraparāv lupyete yathāsamkhyam<sup>1</sup> mācākīyasyā<sup>2</sup> 'cāryasya mate<sup>3</sup>. āpa-----: yā----- evamparāv iti kim: ta-----: vāy----- lupyete iti 'ha punarārambhaḥ pūrvasūtradvayasthitanaḥ<sup>4</sup> sambandhaṣaṅkā-nirākaraṇārthaḥ<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om.; G. M. after *mate*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *māyikāyasyā*, as in the rule itself. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *matena*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*tajanana*; B. -*tajana*; O. -*tananaḥ*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. *ṣaṅkā*; W. -*ṭham*.



rule pointing out that it has a bearing so extensive. Only one example is given for each class: *astu hīs itu abratām* (vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>), and *te enam abhi* (ii.5.6<sup>2</sup>).

The commentator points out, as he did not take the trouble to do under rule 18 of this chapter, that, the rules of combination being thus suspended with reference to these two classes, and no other rule being given about them, they remain in their natural condition.

All the Prātiśākhyas have rules equivalent to this (Rik Pr. ii.27; Vāj. Pr. iv.84; Ath. Pr. iii.33: in the note to Ath. Pr. i.73 I overlooked the present precept of the Tāittirīya-Prātiśākhya); none assumes that the pronouncing a vowel to be *pragraha* exempts it, *eo ipso*, from phonetic combination.

परश्च परश्च ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also the remaining vowel.

That is to say, the vowel remaining after the omission of the final *y* or *v* is, like those mentioned in the preceding rule, exempt from farther combination. According to the commentator, the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward "*y* and *v*," the fact of their constituting an exception is inferred from the neighborhood of the preceding rule, and *parah* means 'another,' and qualifies *saṁdhiḥ* understood: "no further combination takes place." This seems to me inadmissible, as there has been no suggestion of any such word as *saṁdhi*. Perhaps *para* may be better understood of the vowel "following" the *y* and *v* of which the chapter has been treating. It needs, at any rate, some violence to bring in the rule with the meaning which it is evidently intended to bear: no one would have any right to guess, from its form and position alone, at what it is aimed.

The commentator's examples are *apa undantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>) and *agra imam* (i.1.5<sup>1</sup>). In reply to the objection that it would be enough to state the implication of the rule as "where an omission has taken place" instead of "an omission of *y* or *v*," he brings up *se 'd u hotā* (i.1.14<sup>4</sup>), *sāi 'nā 'nikena* (iv.3.13<sup>2</sup> et al.), and *sāu 'shadhiḥ* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), as examples of an elision of a final which does not prevent the further combination of its predecessor and its successor under the rules of this chapter.

25. *cakārākrśṭayor yavakārayor lope sati parah 'saṁdhir na bhavati.*<sup>1</sup> *yathā:* *apa*-----: *agra*----- *saṁnidhyān nishedho labhyate. namu lope sati 'ty' etāvatāi 'vā 'lam: yavakārayor iti kim. se 'd*-----: *'sāi*-----: *sāu*-----: *ity ādi.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyavivarane*  
*daṣamo 'dhyāyaḥ.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *saṁdhiwidhān na bhajate.* (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>3</sup>) W. om. *iti.* (<sup>4</sup>) O. om. (<sup>5</sup>) O. adds *prathamapragne.*

To illustrate the rule, only two phrases, both of frequent occurrence, are quoted: namely *te 'bruvaṇ* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *so 'bravīt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In the other *Prāticākhyas*, the apparent loss of initial *a* after *e* or *o* is treated as an absorption of it into its predecessor, or a unification of the two. See *Ath. Pr.* iii.53 and note, and rule 19 of this chapter, where a somewhat similar view seems suggested.

All the MSS. excepting B. read in the rule *ekāraokārapūrvah*; and, where the rule is quoted (i.61 and ix.13), we have six cases of this reading against three of *ekārduh*. But the former is simply an instance of the usage, so common in the commentary (see above, p. 4), of separating, for the sake of clearness, the elements of compound words, or otherwise disregarding the rules of *sandhi*.

अथात्तोपः ॥ २ ॥

2. Now follow cases of non-elision.

The rest of this chapter is occupied with an enumeration of the cases in which initial *a* is retained. First, in rule 3, a number of passages are specified in which non-elision is the rule, and elision (as determined by the rules of the next chapter) is exceptional; then, in the following rules, more isolated cases are disposed of.

धातारातिरूपवाजपेयनुष्टयेनायोव्यधुवन्नितिरियमेव-  
सायाग्निर्मूर्धरुद्रप्रथमोपोत्तमविकर्षविह्व्यहिरण्यवर्णि-  
ययाज्यामहापृथ्वे ॥ ३ ॥

3. The *a* is not elided in the following sections: those beginning with *dhātā rātiḥ* and *upa*; those styled *vājapeya*; those beginning with *jush'a* and *cyenāya*; those styled *ukhya*; those beginning with *dhruvakshitiḥ*, *iyam eva sâ yâ*, and *agnir mūrdhā*; the first and the next to the last of the *rudra* chapter; and those styled *vikarsha*, *vihavya*, *hiranyavarṇīya*, *yājyâ*, and *mahāpṛshthya*.

Here are pointed out not less than seventy-three sections or *anuvākas*, in which *a* is not elided (except in the cases specified in the rules of the next chapter). Those designated by the annotation of their first words are i.4.44; 5.5:iii.1.10; 2.8:iv.3.4,11; 4.4. The *vājapeya* sections are six, namely i.7.7-12. The *ukhya* sections (as pointed out above, under ix.20) are twenty, namely iv.1.1-10; 2.1-10. The *rudra* chapter is iv.5, containing eleven sections;

'2. 'aṭhe 'ty ayam adhikārah.' *alopa ucyata ity etad adhikṛtani veditavyam ita uttarani yad vakshyāmah.* 'na lopo 'lopaḥ.' *lopābhāva ity arthah.*

① G. M. om; ② all MSS. *na lopaḥ alopaḥ.*

quotation of the beginning of the one *anuvāka* has any right, or can have been intended, to include the other. The right of i.4.33, it may be remarked, to stand in the text to which our *Prāticākhya* applies, is assured by the contemplation of others of its phonetic phenomena by rules found elsewhere (most unequivocally by vi.5); its case of non-elision would seem to have been overlooked by the makers of the treatise, but discovered by the commentators, some of whom have tried to force it violently within the ken of their rules. It is necessary to quote iv.4.4 by two words, because i.6.3 also begins with *agnih*, and in it we find *yo me 'nti dūre 'rātīyati* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>: the example is wanting in G. M.). Finally, instead of *prsthya* passages, the *mahāprsthya* are specified, because of such cases as *prthivī te 'ntarikshena* (v.2.12<sup>2</sup>: the *anuvāka* is *prsthya*, but not *mahāprsthya*).

The commentator cites one or more examples from each of the sections or sets of sections which the rule specifies, as follows. From the section beginning *dhātā rātiḥ* is taken *nidhipatir no agnih* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>); it contains three more cases, and one exception. From that beginning with *upa* comes *āre asme ca* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>); it contains six other cases, and one exception. From the *vājapeya* sections, *te no arvantah* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>) and *te agre aśvam ā 'yuñjan* (i.7.7<sup>2</sup>); they contain eleven examples, and eleven exceptions. The section beginning with *jushṭa* yields *yas te aṅguh* (iii.1.10<sup>1</sup>), and O. alone adds *yo drapso aṅguh* (iii.1.10<sup>1</sup>); there are two other cases, and no exception. From the *cyendya* section, *namaḥ pitr̥bhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>) and *viṣve arapā edhute* (iii.2.8<sup>4</sup>); there are four other cases, and two exceptions. From the *ukhya* sections, *gr̥navanti viṣve amṛtasya putrāḥ* (iv.1.1<sup>2</sup>: only W. has *putrāḥ*) and *namo astu sarpebhyah* (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>); they yield seventy-five cases, and forty-five exceptions. From the section *dhruvakshitiḥ* are cited the only two examples, *viṣve abhi gr̥navantu* (iv.3.4<sup>2</sup>) and *ūrmir drapso apām asi* (iv.3.4<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have *asi*); there are no exceptions. From the section beginning *iyam* etc. are taken *ketum kṛvāne ajare* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *ketum*) and *trayo gharṁāso anu* (iv.3.11<sup>1</sup>); there are three other cases, and one exception. The

*ketum*----: *trayo*----: *iyam ity* <sup>16</sup>*etāvatai 'vā 'lam*.<sup>16</sup> *iyam te sukra tanūr* (i.2.4) *ity* <sup>17</sup>*atrā sag*----: *ity atra mā bhād iti*: *sā ye 'ti padadvayam*<sup>17</sup> *mandadhiyām pratipattiyartham iti kecit*: *anye tv anyathā kathayanti*: *asyā 'nuvākasya śeshabhūtā* <sup>18</sup>*ya rg*<sup>18</sup> *anyatra 'sthitā sā 'pi* <sup>19</sup>*svīkurtavye 'ti*<sup>19</sup>: *o te*----: *agnir mūrādhā* <sup>20</sup>*dīva* (iv.4.4) *ity atra yathā*<sup>20</sup>: *sa*----: *enā*----: *mūrādhe 'ti kin*: *agnir mā durīkṣtā* (i.6.3) *ity atra* <sup>21</sup>*yo me*----<sup>21</sup> *rudrapraṇasya prathamopottamānuvākayor yathā*<sup>22</sup>: *namo*----: *drāpe*----: *uta*----: *uttamasya pūrvataḥ*<sup>23</sup> *saṁni-kṛṣṭa upottamaḥ. aśmann ūrjam* (iv.6.1) <sup>24</sup>*ity atrā 'nuvāka-pañcasya*<sup>24</sup> *vikarshasamjñā*: *tatrā*<sup>25</sup> *'nyam*----: *pāvako*----: *vājō naḥ sapta pradiṣa*<sup>26</sup> (iv.7.12) *ity atrā*<sup>27</sup> <sup>27</sup>*dyanuvākatra*

## अ॒न्हसो॑ऽहतिरनि॒ष्टतो॑ऽवत्वस्मानवद्याद॒हनि च ॥४॥

4. Also in *añhasaḥ*, *añhatih*, *anishṭṛtaḥ*, *avantv asmān*, *avadyāt*, and *ahani*.

The cases of non-clision referred to are as follows: for *añhasaḥ*, *pramuñcanto no añhasaḥ* (iv.3.13<sup>5</sup>); for *añhatih*, *pari dveshaso añhatih* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>); for *anishṭṛtaḥ*, *vardhatām te anishṭṛtaḥ* (iv.1.7<sup>2</sup>); for *avantv asmān*, *te avantv asmān* (ii.6.12<sup>3</sup>), with a counter-example, *te no 'vantu pitaro haveshu* (ii.6.12<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *haveshu*), to prove the necessity of giving *asmān* along with *avantv* in the rule; for *avadyāt*, *mitramahā avadyāt* (i.2.14<sup>6</sup>); and for *ahani*, *gucih cukre ahany ojasind* (iv.4.12<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. stop at *ahani*). All of them occur in passages which are the subject of the preceding rule, and the commentator points out, that the "also" (*ca*) of the rule brings forward the implication of those passages, and that to any of the words specified, if occurring elsewhere in the text, the rule does not apply; citing as example *sa evāi 'nam pāpmano 'ñhaso muñcati* (ii.2.7<sup>4</sup>: all but G. M. stop at *añhasaḥ*). At first sight, then, the rule appears to be a superfluous repetition of part of the cases involved in the preceding one; in fact, however, its value is that of a rehearsal of exceptions under rule xii.4, which teaches that even in the sections above specified, an *a* before a *y*, *v*, *n*, or *h*, if those letters be followed by a vowel, is elided. The only thing calling for explanation about the matter is the connection in which the counter-exceptions are given, which is, to say the least, quite peculiar.

## अनु घर्मासम्रापोमर्तोयस्वोदत्तेवातःपूर्वः ॥५॥

5. Also in *anu*, when preceded by *gharmāsaḥ*, *āpaḥ*, *martah*, *rathah*, *tvah*, *datte*, and *vātaḥ*.

This rule belongs, in part, in the same category with the preceding, as pointing out cases in which the *a* of *anu* is retained according to rule 3 of this chapter, notwithstanding the prohibition of rule xii.4; but in part it is of a more general character, since the last two cases lie outside the sections specified in rule 3.

4. <sup>1</sup> *cakāro dhātārātir* (xi.3) *ityādivishayānvādeṣakaḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *añhasaḥ*..... *ity eteshu grahaṇeshu dhātārātirityādisthaleshv*<sup>3</sup> *ekārapūrvo 'vāu*<sup>4</sup> *'kārapūrvo vā*<sup>5</sup> *'kāro na lupyate. yathā*<sup>6</sup>: *pram*-----: *pari*-----: *vardh*-----: *te*-----: *asmān iti kim*: *te no*-----: *mitr*-----: *gucih*----- *yavanahaparavād*<sup>7</sup> (xii.4) *eshu prāpyamānalopeshv*<sup>8</sup> *alopo 'ya'n*<sup>9</sup> *vihitah. anvādeṣaḥ kimarthaḥ: sa*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *eteshu grahaṇeshu*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*disthalavish*-. <sup>3</sup> B. adds *antarvartishu*; G. M. -*āpattishu*; O. -*lavartishu satsu*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. *vā*. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>7</sup> W. -*ratv*; G. M. -*hasvarapar*-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. ins. *satsu*. <sup>9</sup> W. om.; B. na.

7. Also (after *apah*) in *anu* and *agamat*.

Here, again, the *ca*, 'also,' brings forward only the last word in the preceding rule, namely *apah*—and what is more, gives that word a new character, changing it from *nimittin* to *nimitta* or affecting cause. Of this the commentator takes no notice, and we are doubtless to regard it as quite in order, and as merely adding another to the formidable list of uncertainties involved in the curious system of *anuvṛtti* or continued implication. The passages had in view are *apo anv acārisham* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup>, 46<sup>2</sup>: B. reads *āpo adyā 'nu*, which is the version of the Rīg-Veda, i.23.23) and *apo agamad indrasya* (vii.4.20); as counter-example, is given *paçavo 'nū 'd āyan* (ii.1.5<sup>1</sup>), to prove the implication of *apah*.

### आपःपूर्वे ऽद्विरपानपादस्मान् ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also in *adbhih*, *apām napāt*, and *asmān*, when preceded by *āpah*.

The passages are *sam āpo adbhir agmata* (i.1.8), *devīr āpo apām napāt* (i.2.3<sup>3</sup>: vi.1.4<sup>3</sup>; 4.3<sup>3</sup>), and *āpo asmān mātaraḥ gundhantu* (i.2.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *gundhantu*). The necessity of specifying *napāt* after *apām* is shown by *vārunīr āpo 'pām ca* (ii.1.9<sup>2</sup>), and the restriction to preceding *āpuḥ* by *so 'smān pātu* (v.5.5<sup>1</sup>).

### रायेसन्द्रःपूर्वश्चाकारपरे ॥ ९ ॥

9. In *asmān*, also, if followed by *a*, when *rāye*, *saḥ*, and *indraḥ* precede.

The *ca*, 'also,' again brings down the word last mentioned in the preceding rule. The passages for *saḥ* and *indraḥ* are *mā so asmān avahāya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>) and *indro asmān asmīn dvītiye* (iii.1.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *dvītiye*): and other cases of *asmān* after *saḥ* are to be found at i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.2.7<sup>2</sup>. As counter-examples, are given *so 'smān pātu* (v.5.5<sup>1</sup>), to show that the *asmān* must be followed by *a*; and *smo 'smān amutra* (vi.6.1<sup>4</sup>: all the MSS. of the commentary have the false reading *so 'smān*, such a phrase would be precisely out of place here as illustration), to show that it is only

7. *apa iti cakāro 'nvādiçati: anu: agamat: ity etayor akāro 'na khalv' apahpūrvo lupyate. apo anv-----: apo ag-----: evampūrva iti kim: paçavo-----.*

(1) G. M. O. om. *khalu*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*.

8. *adbhih-----: eteshv' akāra āpahpūrvo na lupyate. sam-----: devīr-----: napāt iti kim: vārunīr-----: āpo-----: evampūrva iti kim: so-----.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *eshv*; O. *eshu grahaṇeshv*.

and second, to show that these words do so only after *te*, *prathamo* 'ngu skandati' (iii. 8<sup>3</sup>: only B. has *skandati*).

Of *agne* after *te*, the text presents eighteen other cases: namely i.2.11<sup>2</sup> twice; 4.43<sup>2</sup>; 5.2<sup>4</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>3</sup>; 6.6<sup>2</sup>; 7.6<sup>4</sup>: iii.4.10<sup>5</sup>; 5.3<sup>2</sup> (a second case): v.4.7<sup>5</sup>; 7.4<sup>1</sup>, 6<sup>3</sup>, 8<sup>1</sup> three times: vi.2.2<sup>7</sup>; 6.1<sup>2</sup>.

## मेपूर्वश्च ॥ ११ ॥

11. In *agne*, also, when preceded by *me*.

Only *agne*, the last word of rule 10, is brought down into this. The commentator quotes *yan me agne asya* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>: W. B. omit *asya*) and *imā me agna ishtakāḥ* (iv.4.11<sup>3,4</sup> and v.4.2<sup>4</sup>); and there is another case in iv.4.11<sup>4</sup>. He adds, as usual, a number of counter-examples, of obvious intent: they are *tena tvā* "dadhe 'gne āngirah" (i.2.12<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *āngirah*), *prāṇaḥ ca me prāṇaḥ* (iv.7.1<sup>1</sup>), and *tad aṣakam tan me rādhi* (i.6.6<sup>3</sup>).

## अस्याश्चिनापरा च ॥ १२ ॥

12. As also, in *asya*, *aṣvinā*, and *aparā*.

That is to say, when these words follow *me*. The passages are *viyantu devā havisho me asya* (i.5.10<sup>3</sup>: O. begins at *devā*), *punar me aṣvinā yuvam cakshuḥ* (iii.2.5<sup>4</sup>: W. B. omit the last word, O. the last two), and *yad vā me aparāgatam* (vi.6.7<sup>2</sup>).

## नःपूर्वो ऽसदग्निरघान्तमोऽभ्यस्मिन्नपथि ॥ १३ ॥

13. Also in *asat*, *agnih*, *agha*, *antamah*, *abhi*, *asmin*, and *adya* *pathi*, when preceded by *naḥ*.

The examples are *supārā no asat vage* (i.2.3<sup>1</sup> and vi.1.4<sup>4</sup>), *ayam no agnir varivah* (i.3.4<sup>1</sup> and i.4.46<sup>3</sup>; there is another case of *no agnih* at v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), *rakshā mākir no aghaṣaṇṣa ṛcata* (i.4.24 and

10. *adya*----- *eteshv*<sup>1</sup> *akāras ta ity evampūrvo na lupyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *paṣum*-----: *upo*-----: <sup>3</sup>*añṣunā*-----: <sup>4</sup>*yat*----- *eteshv iti kim*: <sup>5</sup>*te*-----: *tepūrva iti kim*: *prathamō*-----.

<sup>1</sup> O. *eshu*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om., and ins. *tena tvā* etc.

11. <sup>1</sup>*cakāro* 'gna *ity anvādicati*: *mepūrvo* 'gna *ity atrā* 'kāro' *na lupyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *yan*-----: *imā*-----: *mepūrva iti kim*: *tena*-----: *anvādeṇa*<sup>3</sup> *kim*: <sup>4</sup>*prāṇaḥ*-----: *tad*-----.

(<sup>1</sup>) B. *cakārākrṣhte sati agna ity asminn akāro ma ity evampūrvo*; G. M. the same, omitting *sati*; O. the same, omitting *sati* and the second *iti*. <sup>2</sup> in W. only. <sup>3</sup> O. *-ca iti*. (<sup>4</sup>) O. om.

12. *mepūrva iti cakāro* 'nvādicati: *asya*----- <sup>1</sup>*eteshv*<sup>2</sup> *akāro mepūrvo na lupyate. vi*-----: *punar*-----: *yad*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> O. *eshv*.

and accordingly—resorting, as we cannot well help saying, to one of his usual subterfuges—he declares *agni* (or, according to W. B. O., *gni*) “a part of a word, intended to include a number of cases occurring in another *sākhā*,” not going so far, however, as to quote any of these cases. I suspect *gniparah* to be either a corruption of *gniḥ*, or originally intended as equivalent with it.

The passages are *āvinno agnir gr̥hapatiḥ* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>) and *somo agnir upa devāḥ* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>); and the commentator adds counter-examples, so *gnir jātaḥ* (v.1.4<sup>1</sup>) and *āvinno yam asāu* (i.8.12<sup>2</sup>).

धीरासोऽदब्धासएकादशासऋषीणांपुत्रःशार्यतिष्ठाठःपि-  
तारःपृथिवीयज्ञासतेयेगृह्णाम्येवाऽऽषत्तज्ञेसस्फानोयु-  
वयोःपृष्ठेपतिर्वीगोशुष्मःपुवःसमिद्धऋषभःपाथोवचोव-  
र्षिष्ठेजुषाणोयोरुद्रोवृष्णाःपूर्वः ॥ १६ ॥

16. Also *a* is retained when preceded by *dhīrāsaḥ*, *adabdhāsaḥ*, *ekādaśasaḥ*, *rshinām putrah*, *cāryāte*, *ashādhaḥ*, *pitārah*, *prthivī yajñe*, *āsate ye*, *grhṇāmy agre*, *vāñ eshaḥ*, *yajñe*, *sañsphānaḥ*, *yuvayor yah*, *prsthē*, *patir vah*, *go*, *ṣushmah*, *puvah*, *samiddhaḥ*, *rshabhah*, *pāthah*, *vacah*, *varshishthe*, *jushāno*, *yo rudrah*, or *vṛshnah*.

The passages had in view are quoted as follows: *tām dhīrāso anūdr̥gya yajante* (i.1.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word); *odabdhāso adabdhāmyam* (i.1.10<sup>2</sup> and iii.5.6<sup>1</sup>); *ekādaśaso apsushadaḥ* (i.4.11); *rshinām putro adhīrāja eshaḥ* (i.3.7<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), with a counter-example, *yasya putro jātaḥ* (i.5.8<sup>5</sup>; 7.6<sup>5</sup>), to show the need of including *rshinām* in the *nimitta*; *yathā cāryāte apibah* (i.4.18: G. M. omit *yathā*); *ashādho agniḥ* (i.5.10<sup>1-2</sup>); *vatpitāro agne devāḥ* (i.5.10<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. omit *devāḥ*); *prthivī yajñe asmin* (i.6.5<sup>1</sup>), with a counter-example, *te mā smin yajñe* (iii.2.4<sup>1</sup>), where, as only W. B. point out, the *jatā*-text shows the mutilation of *asmin* after *yajñe* not preceded by *prthivī* (thus, *asmin yajñe yajñe sminn asmin yajñe*); *adhyāsate ye antarikshe* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>), with *ye prthivyām ye ntarikshe* (iv.5.11<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the first *ye*) as counter-example; *mayi grhṇāmy agre agnim* (v.7.9<sup>1-2</sup>), with *ashāu kṛvo gre bhi shunoti* (vi.4.5<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *shunoti*) as counter-example; *idāvāñ esho asura* (i.6.6<sup>4</sup> and iii.1.11<sup>1</sup>), with *ṣukra esho nto ntaṁ manushyaḥ* (vii.2.7<sup>2</sup>: O. stops at

15. *āvinnaḥ: somah:* <sup>1</sup> *evampūrvo* <sup>2</sup> *kāro* <sup>3</sup> *gniparo* <sup>4</sup> *na lupyate: agni* <sup>5</sup> *ti paddikādeṣaḥ sākhāntare bahūpādānārthaḥ. āvinno* -----: *somo* -----: *evampūrva iti kim: so* -----: *evampara iti kim: āvinno* -----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *agni ity evamparah akāro*; B. *akārah agniparo*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. *gni*.

अरतिमस्ययज्ञस्यातिद्रुतोऽतियत्यनृणोऽविष्यन्ननमीवो-  
 ज्नेष्वर्चिरजीतानज्यानिमद्वियाश्चम्वाल्यर्वत्तमस्त्वकृणोद-  
 ङ्गिरोऽप्सुयोश्चस्वभायदच्युतोऽश्वसनिर्स्थभिरशिभ्रेदङ्गे-  
 ऽग्निय ॥ १७ ॥

17. Also in *aratim*, *asya yajñasya*, *atidrutah*, *ati yanti*, *anrñah*, *avishyan*, *anamīvah*, *anneshu*, *arcih*, *ajītān*, *ajyānim*, *ahnīyāh*, *ambāli*, *arvantam*, *astu*, *akṛnot*, *aṅgrah*, *apsu yoḥ*, *askabhāyat*, *acyutah*, *açvasaniḥ*, *asthabhiḥ*, *açiçret*, *aṅge*, and *aghnīya*.

The passages had in view are quoted by the commentator as follows, with such counter-examples as are needed to justify the inclusion of more than one *pada* in any case: *mūrdhānam divo aratim prthivyāh* (i.4.13 and vi.5.2<sup>1</sup>: O. begins at *divuḥ*, and it alone has *prthivyāh*); *yan me agne āsya yajñasya* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>2</sup>), with the counter-example *ete syā 'mushmin* (vi.1.10<sup>5</sup>); *pratyāñk somo atidrutah* (i.8.21: all the MSS. here insert the *k* before *somo*, as required by v.32, and G. M. even convert it to *kh*, according to xiv.12); *paçyanto ati yanti* (iii.2.2<sup>1</sup>), and, as counter-example to both these last examples, *nai 'nañ somo 'ti pavate* (vi.5.11<sup>4</sup>: O. begins at *somo*); *tad agne anrño bhavāmi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *bhavāmi*); *na yavase avishyan* (iv.4.3<sup>3</sup>); *svāvego anamīvo bhavā nah* (iii.4.10<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit *bhavā nah*); *ye anneshu vividhyanti* (iv.5.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); *jātavedo yo arcih* (v.7.8<sup>1</sup>); *çarado ajītān* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *teshām yo ajyānim* (v.7.2<sup>3</sup>); *tiroahniyā mā suhutāh* (vii.3.13: O. omits *suhutāh*); *ambe ambāli* (vii.4.19<sup>1,2</sup> twice, <sup>3</sup> twice); *yo arvantam jighāṁsati* (vii.4.15: O. omits the last word); *bahis te astu bāl iti* (iii.3.10<sup>2</sup>: O. stops at *astu*; the text furnishes eleven other cases of *astu* with *a* retained, at i.2.3<sup>3</sup>; 4.45<sup>1</sup>; 8.14<sup>2</sup>: iii.1.1<sup>4</sup>; 2.5<sup>7</sup>, 8<sup>2</sup>; v.5.9<sup>3</sup> twice; 7.2<sup>4</sup>, 4<sup>3,4</sup>); *ita indro*

17. *aratim*.....<sup>1</sup> *eteshv akdro 'na khalv' ekārapūrva okāra-pūrvo vā-lupyate. yathā'*: *mūrdh*.....: *yan*.....: *yajñasye 'ti kim*: *ete*.....: *pratyāñ*.....: *paçy*.....: *drutoyanti 'ty ābhyām'* *kim*: *nai*.....: *tad*.....: *na*.....: *svāv*.....: *ye*.....: *jāta-vedo*.....: *çarado*.....: *teshām*.....: *tiro*.....: *ambe*.....: *yo*.....: *bahis*.....: *ita*.....: *agne*.....: *yo*.....: *ya iti kim*: *açvo*.....: *yo*.....: *madāya*.....: *yo*.....: *sanir iti kim*: *açvebhyo*.....: *indro*.....: *bhir'* *iti kim*: *'çam*.....: *ity atra'* *jātāyām'*: *asthabhyo*.....: *varuṇo*.....: *aṅge*.....: *aghnīye 'ty akāragrhitah padāikadeṣo bahūpādānārthah*: *etāni*.....: *yad*.....: *payo*.....

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. the enumeration, and ins. *iti*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. *'khalv*, and put *na* next before *lupyate*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> B. *tābhyām*; G. M. *etābhyām*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. *asthabhir*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. om.



words, instead of three, are cited in the repetition. As counter-examples, showing the value of the restriction "when a vowel follows," are given *gug vā agnih so 'dhvaryum* (v.6.2<sup>4</sup>) and *andho 'dhvaryuh syāt* (v.1.3<sup>1</sup> and vi.1.8<sup>3</sup>: O. alone has *syāt*, and, without that addition, the phrase is found also at v.1.3<sup>2</sup>). This proves that what is to be "followed by a vowel" is the *r* of *adhvara*; but how that meaning is conveyed by the terms of the rule is not easy to discover. The MSS. are at variance as to the reading of the first word of the rule, T. W. B. O. giving *adhvara*, and G. M. *adhware*, between which I am at a loss to decide confidently, because neither of them appears to be what is wanted. But I prefer *adhvara*, both because it is better supported, and because it is not the usage of the treatise to put in a case-form the words or themes which it cites from the text.

An additional case falling under the rule is *ardhvo adhvarah* (i.1.12); and yet others (as i.5.5<sup>1</sup> twice, and, doubtless, i.4.46<sup>2-3</sup>), to which it would else apply, are disposed of under the general rule xi.3.

## स पूर्वस्यार्धसदृशमेकेषामर्धसदृशमेकेषाम् ॥ ११ ॥

19. In the opinion of some, it becomes half-similar with its predecessor.

This is a very blind precept, and we are permitted to doubt whether its purport is interpreted aright by the commentary; in which, moreover, there are peculiar and unintelligent variations of reading. What letter is the subject of the rule—the elided *a*, or the non-elided? The comment says the latter (although the majority of MSS. blunderingly say the "non-protracted" instead), and states that it acquires a quantity similar to half a *mora*, or becomes one and a half *moras* long. It is added, that no special examples are given, because such would not bring to light any difference (? only O. has the reading that means this: W. B. omit the "not;" G. M. are unintelligible). This appears to me quite unsatisfactory. The distinct demonstrative *sa* in the rule ought to point back to something distinctly stated above, and that is the

19. *yo 'yam akāro 'hptaḥ' sa pūrvasyāi 'kārasyaṁ 'kārasya' vā 'rdhamātrasadṛṣaṁ' kalam bhajata' ity ekeshāṁ r̥shnām matam*<sup>1</sup>: 'adhyardhamātraḥ syād' ity arthaḥ. *uktāny evo 'dāharanāni viçeshādarganāt*<sup>2</sup>. *ardhena sadṛṣo 'rdhasadṛṣaḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *tam ardhasadṛṣam*<sup>10</sup>.

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarana* <sup>11</sup>

*ekādaṣo 'dhyāyāḥ*. <sup>12</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. *aphutaḥ*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *ekāraakirapirvasya*. <sup>3</sup> W. -*trani sad*-; G. M. -*trāsad*-. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *labhata*. <sup>5</sup> O. *ācāryāṇām*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>(7)</sup> W. O. -*trasyām*; B. G. M. -*ra syād*. <sup>8</sup> W. B. -*shadar*-; G. M. *darganāt*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *yāḥ*. <sup>10</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. ins. *prathamapragne*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. add *ṣṛikṣhṇāya namaḥ*.

3. But not when *garbhah*, *saṁnaddhah*, *yamah*, or *bhadrah* precedes.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *garbho asy osha-dhīnām* (iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), *saṁnaddho asi vīdayasva* (iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>), *asi yamo asy ādityah* (iv.6.7<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last word), and *tvam bhadro asi kratuh* (iv.3.13<sup>1</sup>). There is another case of *asi* after *garbhah* at iv.1.4<sup>2</sup>, which is then repeated at v.1.5<sup>3</sup>, the *a* standing this time unelided by rule i.61.

As usual, the commentator thinks it necessary to account for the inclusion of the double *pada sam-naddhah*, instead of simply *naddhah*, in the rule. Some, he says, quote as counter-example *upanaddho 'surah* (iv.4.9); but its propriety is questionable, since the passage does not fall under xi.3, and moreover, there is no *asi* in it (O. has the good sense to pass without notice this most absurd suggestion); and the valid counter-example is to be sought in another *śākhā*. We have here an unusually clear example of the arbitrary way in which the plea *śākhāntare* is resorted to, in order to avoid the attribution of a slight inconsistency to the treatise-makers.

## यवनहपरः स्वरपरेषु ॥ ४ ॥

4. *A* is elided before *y*, *v*, *n*, and *h*, when these are followed by a vowel.

The examples given are *hiraṇyaṣṛṅgo 'yo asya pādāh* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *pādāh*), *vanaspate 'vā sṛjā rarāṇah* (iv.1.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *rarāṇah*), *varēṇyo 'nu prayānam* (iv.1.10<sup>4</sup>), and *jambhayanto 'him vrkam* (i.7.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *vrkam*). These are but specimens selected from among a considerable number of cases: namely, before *y*, two; before *v*, nineteen; before *o*, fourteen (all but three of them, cases of *anu*, the counter-exceptions to which form in part the subject of xi.5); before *h* (which, as the counter-exceptions noted in xi.4 show, includes also *ñh*), five; in all, forty. To show the necessity of the restriction "when these are followed by a vowel," are cited *gukraṁ te anyat* (iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>) and *agre aḥnāñ hitah* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>: O. omits *hitah*).

There is a well-established difference of reading here in the rule itself: T. B. G. M. have *yavanaha svarupareshu*, only W. and O. adding *para* (which I have amended to *paraḥ*) after *ha*. So also,

3. *garbhah*-----<sup>1</sup> *evampūrvah sānnidhyāl labdhe 'si' 'ty as-min grahaṇe'* <sup>2</sup> *kāro 'na' lopyate. garbho*-----: *saṁnaddho*-----: *'sam iti kim: upan*----- *iti kecid udāharanti: tuc cint-yam: dhātārātir* (xi.3) *ityādyantalpātityābhāvād asiṣabdā-darṣanād 'ca: mukhyam tu' śākhāntare vijñeyam pratyudāharaṇam*<sup>6</sup>. *asi*-----: *tvañ*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> W. *tasminn asi*. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *ekārapūrva ekārapūrvavā*. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. simply *udāharanam śākhāntare*. <sup>7</sup> W. *cā 'mukhyam kintu*.

of a word, so given for the sake of conciseness, and including the two cases *aṅgirasvad ahe 'mo 'gnim* and *aṅgirasvad bharishyāmo 'gnim* (both iv.1.2<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *aṅgirasvad* in each). The other passages had in view by the rule are *vaco 'gnaye bharatā brhat* (iii.2.11<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last two words), *dudhāno 'gnir hotā* (iv.1.3<sup>4</sup>), and *sadhashe 'gnim purishyam* (iv.1.3<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *purishyam*). To prove the implication of *gn* only, is given *sadhashe adhy utturasmīn* (iv.6.5<sup>3</sup>; 7.13<sup>4</sup>: v.7.7<sup>2</sup>: O. omits).

By xi.16, *vacaḥ* does not as a general thing elide the following *a*; but there is no clashing between the two rules, as they have reference to different parts of the text.

अभ्यावर्तिन्नूपमपिदधाम्यद्यान्वदितिःशर्माग्नेर्जिह्वामग्र-  
यःपप्रयोऽस्माकमस्मेधत्ताप्रमाश्चाश्रुतिरश्यामामार्यमन्नस्म-  
त्याशानस्मिन्यज्ञेऽस्ताव्यथमानाभिद्रोहमधाप्यदोऽज्योऽदु-  
ग्धाश्चरिष्टाश्चर्याश्चर्त्त्यन्तरस्यामन्नस्थानायाङ्गिरस्वदकरम्

॥ ७ ॥

7. The *a* is elided in *abhyāvartin*, *apūpam*, *api dadhāmi*, *adyā 'nu*, *aditiḥ ṣarma*, *agner jīhvām*, *agnayah paprayah*, *asmākam*, *asne dhatta*, *aṣmā*, *aṣvā* wherever found, *aṣyāma*, *amā*, *aryaman*, *asmatpācān*, *asmīn yajñe*, *ustā*, *ayathamānā*, *abhidroham*, *adhāyī*, *adah*, *atho*, *adugdhāḥ*, *arishṭāḥ*, *arathāḥ*, *arcanti*, *antar usyām*, *atra stha*, *annāya*, *aṅgirasvad*, and *akaram*.

The commentator gives an example for each specification of the rule, with counter-examples for every case in which more than one *pada* is taken, as follows: *agne 'bhyāvartin* (iv.2.1<sup>2</sup>), and, as counter-example, *kāmena kṛto abhy ānad arkam* (i.1.14<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two); *bhadraḥoce 'pūpam deva* (iv.2.2<sup>3</sup>: only W. has *devu*); *agne 'pi dadhāmy āsye* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>), and, as counter-example, *baddho apikuksha āsani* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word); *anu no 'dyū 'numatiḥ* (iii.3.11<sup>3</sup>: iv.4.12<sup>5</sup>; 7.15<sup>5</sup>), and, as counter-example, *pra tat te adya gīpīrishṭa nāma* (ii.2.12<sup>5</sup>: O. ends with *adya*, and G. M. substitute another passage,

6. *gnapara iti cakāro jñāpayati: mah----- ity evampārvo gnaparo 'nudātto 'py' 'akūralopo bhavati.' yuthā: aṅgi-----: ma ity 'atra pudāikadeḡagrahaṇam' saṅkshepārtham: aṅgir-----: vaco-----: dudhāno-----: sadhashe----- 'anvādeḡaḥ kimarthaḥ.' sadh----- gnaparasyā 'kārasya' 'nudāttārtho 'yam ārambhah.*

(1) in W. only. (2) G. M. O. *akāro lopyate*. (3) in W. only. (4) G. M. *apadagrahaṇam*. (5) G. M. *anvādeḡena kim*; O. om., along with the following example. (6) in W. only.

'*si* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *prasitim*); *mā suparno 'vyathamānā* (iv.2.9<sup>1</sup>); *jane 'bhidroham manushyāh* (iii.4.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *manushyāh*), with a counter-example, *brhaspate abhiçaster amuñcah* (iv.1.7<sup>4</sup>: only W. has *amuñcah*); *upa prā 'gāt sumanme 'dhāyi manma* (iv.6.8<sup>3</sup>: all but O. begin at *sum-*, and G. M. end with '*dhāyi*'); *ye 'do rocane divaḥ* (iv.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *divaḥ*); *mahyam agne 'tho sīda* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; 2.1<sup>5</sup>); *çāra nonumo 'dugdhāh* (ii.4.14<sup>2</sup>); *pūrve 'rishṭāh syāma* (iv.7.14<sup>2</sup>: all the MSS. read *-shṭā*); *ye pavayo 'rathāh* (i.6.12<sup>6</sup>: only G. M. have *ye*); *gāyatrino 'reanty arkam* (i.6.12<sup>2-3</sup>: only G. M. have *arkam*); *abhi çāguco 'ntar asyām* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup>; another case at iv.2.3<sup>3</sup>), with the counter-example *rukmo antar vi bhāti* (iv.1.10<sup>4-5</sup> et al.); *ye 'tra stha purānāh* (iv.2.4<sup>1</sup>), with the counter-example *tvashṭā no atra varivah* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>); *rāyas posho 'nnāya tvā* (i.7.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *tvā*); *prthivyāh sadhusthe 'ñgirasvat* (iv.1.6<sup>1,2</sup> four times; other cases at iv.1.1<sup>3,4</sup> three times); and *aham tebhyo 'karam namaḥ* (iv.5.1<sup>3</sup>).

गाहमानोज्ञायमानोद्देतयोमन्यमानोवनस्पतिभ्यःपते-  
स्त्रिस्तपसःस्वधावोभामितोऽग्नयन्नायोऽध्वेयीक्रतोपूर्वः

॥ ८ ॥

8. An *a* is elided when preceded by *gāhamānaḥ*, *jāyamānaḥ*, *hetayaḥ*, *manyamānaḥ*, *vanaspatibhyaḥ*, *pate*, *sridhaḥ*, *tapasaḥ*, *svadhāvaḥ*, *bhāmituḥ*, *agnayaḥ*, *āyo*, *adhvaryo*, and *krato*.

The quoted passages are *gāhamāno 'dāyah* (iv.6.4<sup>2</sup>); *jāyamāno 'hnam ketuḥ* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>); *hetayo 'nyum asmat* (iv.5.10<sup>5</sup>); *manyamāno 'martyam* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>); *vanaspatibhyo 'dhi sambhrtām* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word), with the counter-example *namaḥ pitrbhyo abhi* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>); *annapate 'nnasya* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> and [by i.61] v.2.2<sup>1</sup>); *niho atī sridho 'ty acittim* (iv.1.7<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the first two words); *tapaso 'dhi jātaḥ* (iv.2.10<sup>4</sup>); *deva svadhāro 'nrtasya dhāma* (iii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word and the last), with the counter-example *anyā vo anyām avatu* (iv.2.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word); *bhāmīto 'mitrasyā 'bhīdāsataḥ* (i.6.12<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word); *yān agnayo 'nvatapyanta* (iii.2.8<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *yān*); *agne 'dabdhāyo 'çitatano* (i.1.13<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *agne*); *adhvaryo 'ver apāsh* (vi.4.3<sup>4</sup>: O. ends at *'veh*); and *çatakrato 'nu te dāyi* (ii.5.12<sup>5</sup>).

A special explanation is required for the passage in which *agnayaḥ* occurs, since the following *padu* is *anu*, which might seem to

8. *gāhamānaḥ*..... *ity evampūrvo*<sup>4</sup> *'kāro lupyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>:  
*gāh*-----: *jāy*-----: *hetayo*.....: *many*-----: *vanas*-----:  
*vanaspati* 'ti kim: *namaḥ* : *anna*-----: *niho*-----: *tapaso*  
-----: *deva*-----: *svadhe* 'ti kim: *anyā*-----: *bhāmīto*-----:  
*yān*--- : *ukārasya vakāravikriyāyām vyañjanaparo nakāra*<sup>3</sup> *iti*  
*yavanaha* (xii.4) *nishedhābhāvād alope prāpte tadapavādo*

(i.4.33) already treated of under xi.3 (p. 244), I have found only two cases of *a* retained which are not accounted for: namely *ūrdhvo asthāt* (v.2.1<sup>5</sup>; R-V. x.1.1) and *so agnih* (v.2.3<sup>2</sup>; R-V. vii. 1.16); and both these I suspect to fall under i.61, I having failed to note the previous occurrence of the passages. Of cases explained by i.61 there is a considerable number; only, as was remarked under that rule (see p. 47), there are three among them to which, if the commentator's forced interpretation of its terms be admitted, it cannot be made to apply. Of cases of elision of *a* unaccounted for, I have found none. Of course, my examination of the *Sanhitā*, having been made by the help of a single *samhitā* manuscript, is not to be credited as absolutely accurate: yet I have a good deal of faith in the trustworthiness of its result.

तस्मिन्ननुदात्ते पूर्व उदात्तः स्वरितम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. When the elided *a* is grave, the preceding diphthong, if acute, becomes circumflex.

All the *Prāticākhyas*, and the usage of the known Vedic texts, are in accord upon this point (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55). To the particular circumflex hence resulting, the treatise gives later (xx.4) the name *abhinihata*; the others call it *abhinihāta*. The examples given are *tē 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.) and *sō 'bravit* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

The representation of the tone of the elided *a* in the resulting accent of the eliding diphthong, of course, favors the view that regards it as absorbed into the latter, rather than elided.

उदात्ते चानुदात्त उदात्तम् ॥ १० ॥

10. When it is acute, the preceding diphthong, if grave, becomes acute.

This, also, is a universal usage. The commentator quotes two examples: *āva rundhatē 'satram vā'i* (vii.3.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *ava*) and *ānnapatē 'nnasya* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> and v.2.2<sup>1</sup>).

स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र स्वरितश्च सर्वत्र ॥ ११ ॥

11. As also, in every case, if circumflex.

The commentator explains *ca*, 'also,' as bringing down *udātte*,

9. *yam*<sup>1</sup> *adhikṛtyā* 'yam *prabandha* *uktas* *tusminn*<sup>2</sup> *akāre* 'nu-  
dātte *lupte sati pūrva ekāra okāro vo* 'dāttaḥ<sup>3</sup> *svaritam āpadyate*.  
*yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *tē*-----: *sō*-----.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *ayam*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *asm-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. put next after *pūrva*. <sup>4</sup> in B. only.

10. *tusminn*<sup>1</sup> *evā* 'kāra *udātte*<sup>2</sup> *lupte sati*<sup>3</sup> *pūrva ekāra okāro vā*  
'*nudātta udāttam āpadyate*. *yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *āva*-----: *anna*-----.

<sup>1</sup> O. *asm-*. <sup>2</sup> O. puts next after *eva*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> in O. only.

A general heading, of which, however, the force extends but a very little way (through rule 4). The subject is a supplement to that treated at v.27-31, where we are told what is done with *m* before a mute, or before any other semivowel than *r*.

रेफोष्मपरः ॥ २ ॥

2. A *m* is omitted, when followed by *r* or a spirant.

This omission of *m* is accompanied, according to xv.1-3, by the nasalization of the preceding vowel, or else the insertion of *anusvāra* after it. Respecting the relation of these alternative views to one another, see the note to ii.30. The definition of the *m* as lost or omitted accords best with the former view: it is sufficiently logical and consistent to say that the consonant is lost and the vowel nasalized; if, however, an *anusvāra*, as a separate vocal element, is to take the place of *m* after the vowel, the only acceptable form of statement must be that the *m* is directly converted into *anusvāra*. This form of statement is in fact adopted by the Rik (iv.5) and Vāj. (iv.1) Prātiśākhya, which acknowledge an *anusvāra*, while the other is rightly preferred by the Ath. Prāt. (ii.32, i.67), which holds the theory of the nasalized vowel: our own treatise, as was pointed out above (p. 68), trims between the two views.

The commentator's examples are *pratyushtuñ rakshaḥ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *sañcītaṁ me brahma* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>: v.1.10<sup>2</sup>), *tañ shuḍ ahāni* (v.5.2<sup>3</sup>), *sañ-sam id yuvase vṛshan* (ii.6.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *vṛshan*), and *tvañ ha yad yavishthya* (ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples are given: to show that *m* before other letters is not dropped, *idaṁ vām āsye* (iii.3.11<sup>1</sup>); to show that the dropped *m* must be a final, *tasmāt tāmrā āpaḥ* (vi.4.2<sup>4</sup>). The commentator, namely, has quietly introduced the limitation *padāntaḥ*, 'when final,' into his explanation of the rule, without pointing out whence he derives it: it comes, in fact, only from the general scope of the treatise, which thus far, having the relation of *pada* and *samhitā* texts under treatment, has dealt almost exclusively with final and initial letters.

यवकारपरश्चैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ ३ ॥

3. As also, according to some teachers, when followed by *y* or *v*.

2. *rephaḥ* <sup>1</sup> *co* <sup>2</sup> *śhmaḥ* <sup>3</sup> *ca* *padānto* <sup>3</sup> *makāro* *lupyate*.  
*yathā*<sup>4</sup>: *praty*-----: *sañ*-----: *tañ*-----: *sañ*-----: *tvañ*-----  
<sup>5</sup> *evampara* *iti kim*: *idaṁ*-----: *padānta* *iti kim*: *tasmāt*-----<sup>5</sup>  
*rephaḥ* *co* <sup>6</sup> *śhmaḥ* <sup>6</sup> *ca* <sup>6</sup> *rephoshmāṇaḥ*: *te* *pare* <sup>7</sup> *yasmāt* *sa*  
*tathoktaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> W. *rephaḥ*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. *ca*. <sup>3</sup> B. -*nte*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. -*mā*.  
<sup>7</sup> B. G. M. O. *rephoshmāṇaḥ* *tāu* *parāu*.

retain an unchanged *m* before *rā*, and *sañrarāṇaḥ* (i.4.44<sup>1</sup>) to show that only *rā*, not *ra*, effects the retention.

According to W. B. O., the particle *iti* in the rule is intended to deny the application to the word here had in view of rule xiv.28, respecting duplication, and to assure the duplication of the *m* before the *r*. But G. M. insert *tu*, 'but,' in the rule after *iti*, ascribing to it the effect just defined, and making the *iti* simply signify that the words mentioned, and no others, are the subjects of the rule. And G. (not M.) writes the examples accordingly, *samnrājam* and *sānmrājyāya*. That this bit of constructive interpretation is a pure figment of the commentators does not need to be pointed out; respecting its occasion and bearing, see the note to xiv.28. I have adopted the reading of W. etc., which is presumably the older and more genuine: in the comment on xiv.28, even G. M. agree with the others in making *iti* the bond of connection between the two rules.

## अथ वर्णानाम् ॥ ५ ॥

### 5. Now of individual sounds.

According to the comment on rule xxiv.2 (see the note to that rule), we have here one of the main division lines of the treatise. Thus far, from the beginning of the fifth chapter, we have had to do chiefly with the combination of separate words or *padas* into connected text; now we turn to the determination of individual letters, which are read alike in both forms of text. That the intention of the treatise-makers recognized so grand a transition here may be doubted; but that the change is one of some importance is not questionable.

## ऋकार्कार्षपूर्वी. नकारो णकारश्च समानपदे ॥ ६ ॥

6. Within the same word, a *n* preceded by *r*, *ṛ*, *r*, or *sh*, becomes *ṇ*.

5. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: varṇānām samhitā vakshyatu' ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam: 'atha vā:² athaṣabdaḥ³ padasamihitaṇishedhakah.⁴*

<sup>1</sup> O. *ucyata*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>3</sup> B. *ṣabdaḥ*. <sup>4</sup> B. *-tāyām nish*.

6. *samānapada ekapada ṛkārarkārarephashakārapūro¹ nakāro nakāram² āpadyate³. tribhir-----: tvañ-----: esha-----: kṛshno-----:⁴ evampūrva iti kim: devānām-----:⁴ samānapada iti kim: ebhir-----: samānam ca tat padam ca samānapadam: tasmīn.*

O. has a *lacuna*, beginning with *-napade* at the end of the rule, and ending with *tribhir ṛ-* in the first example. <sup>1</sup> G. M. *ṛṛkārareph-*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *ṇatvam*. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *āpnoti*. <sup>4</sup> O. *om*.

## पाणिगणपुण्यकण्वाणगाणबाणवेणुगुणमणिप्रवादिषु पूर्वः ॥ १ ॥

9. Also, in the inflectional and derivative forms of *pāṇi*, *gaṇa*, *punya*, *kaṇva*, *kāṇa*, *gāṇa*, *bāṇa*, *veṇu*, *guṇa*, and *maṇi*, the first nasal is *ṇ*.

The word *pravāda* is not found elsewhere in our treatise or its commentary. From the latter's explanation and use of it we derive for it a meaning somewhat different from that which, according to Regnier (note to Rik Pr. ii.39), it bears in the Rik *Prātiśākhya*. The latter makes it mean 'theme:' in our comment, on the other hand, it evidently signifies a derived form of a theme, in any gender or case, in composition, or in extension by secondary suffix; and I have translated it accordingly. So far as I can see, however, the same signification belongs to it in most of the passages of the Rik Pr. also, and Regnier's exposition of its use calls for revision.

There is an abrupt change of implication here, without any intimation of it in the terms of the precept itself; it is only at the end of rule 14, below, that we find the word *prākṛtāḥ*, which we must understand as applying to rules 9-14—a kind of footing instead of heading (*adhikāra*): see another like case in the third chapter, rules 2-7 (note on iii.2). In this connected paragraph of rules we have an enumeration of the words in which a *ṇ* is "original," and hence found equally in all the forms of the text.

The examples are *supāṇiḥ svaṅguriḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>4</sup>: iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O., in this and the two following examples, has only the first word), *vṛshapānayo 'vādāḥ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>), and *hiraṇyapāṇim itaye* (i.4.25: ii.2.12<sup>2</sup>): the text contains half a dozen other examples of the *pravāda*s of *pāṇi*;—*gaṇānām tvā gaṇapatiḥ havāmahe* (ii.3.14<sup>3</sup>: O. omits the last word), *gaṇā me mā vi tṛṣṇan* (iii.1.8<sup>2</sup>), *gaṇena gaṇam* (v.4.7<sup>7</sup>), and *dāreāmītraḥ ca gaṇaḥ* (iv.6.5<sup>6</sup>): the cases,

9. *pāṇi*<sup>1</sup> 'tyādīḥ abdinām<sup>2</sup> pravādeshu pūrvaḥ prathamo nakārah prakṛtyāi<sup>3</sup> 'va veditavyaḥ. prakarshena vādāḥ<sup>4</sup> pravādaḥ<sup>5</sup>: līṅga-vibhaktibhedasamāsataddhitādibhir<sup>6</sup> nirdeṣa<sup>7</sup> ity arthaḥ. yathā<sup>8</sup>: sup-----: vṛshap-----: hiraṇ-----: gaṇānām-----: gaṇā-----: gaṇena-----: dāre-----: punyo-----: sād-----: kaṇvā-----: tasyāi-----: akarṇayā-----: gānap-----: viṣalyo-----: venur-----: venunā-----: yad-----: yathā-----: maṇind-----: 'nanu gaṇaḥ abda<sup>9</sup> pravādatvād gānagrahaṇam ayuktam: 'māi 'vam: ' gaṇa pravādatve sati tad bhavet: kiṁtu gaṇapatiḥ abda pravādo 'yam. pūrva iti kim: gaṇ-----: ven-----: maṇ-----: ' ityādīḥ<sup>10</sup> 'ttarasya<sup>11</sup> natvam mā bhūd iti.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ādinām grahaṇānām. <sup>2</sup> W. -dāḥ. <sup>3</sup> W. -vādāḥ; G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. om. bheda. <sup>5</sup> W. nirdeṣitā. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> W. 'vam. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. -ra-nakārasya.



The examples are *çitikanthāya ca* (iv.5.5<sup>1</sup>: but G. M. have instead *çitikanthāya svāhā*, which I do not find in the text, not even at vii.3.17, where a number of similar expressions are read) and *kandūyeta pāmanambhāvukāh* (vi.1.3<sup>2</sup>: O. has the first word only). The combinations *ñt* and *ñdh* do not occur in the Sanhitā.

चङ्कुणफणत्स्थूणीहिणुयाद्विणोतिकौणियोऽणिष्ठाउल्ब-  
णमुगणाश्रुतिश्रुपुणीकाबाणिजायाणवश्चाट्णारस्थाणुतू-  
णवेवीणायामश्नोण्यापणेत्तवाणीःकल्याणीकुणपंवाणः-  
शतशोणाश्रुतिर्धाणिकामेणी ॥ १२ ॥

12. Also in *cañkuna*, *phanat*, *sthūnāu*, *hinuyāt*, *hinoti*, *kāruneyah*, *anishthāh*, *ulbanam*, *uganā* wherever found, *cupunīkā*, *bāñijāya*, *anavaç ca*, *āñārah*, *sthānum*, *tūñave*, *vññāyām*, *açloṇayā*, *paneta*, *vāñāh*, *kalyāñi*, *kuṇapam*, *vāñah çata*. *çonā* wherever found, *dhāñikā*, and *m eni*.

The passages aimed at are quoted by the commentator as follows: *avabhṛtha nicañkuna niceruh* (i.4.45<sup>2</sup>: all but O. omit *niceruh*, which would allow the passage to be found also at vi.6.3<sup>4</sup>; O. omits *avabhṛtha*): *nicañkuna* occurs a second time in i.4.45<sup>2</sup>; *anvāpanīphanat* (i.7.8<sup>3</sup>); *ayāsthānāv uditāu* (i.8.12<sup>3</sup>); *bhrātṛvyāya pra hinuyāt* (ii.2.6<sup>5</sup>: O. begins with *pra*); *evā smāi pra hinoti* (ii.2.6<sup>5</sup>); *rajanō vāi kāruneyah* (ii.3.8<sup>1</sup>); *ye nishthās tām* (ii.5.5<sup>2</sup>); *yajña ulbanam kriyate* (iii.4.3<sup>7</sup>), and also, by i.53, *anulbanam* (at iii.4.3<sup>6</sup>); *avyādhinir uganā uta* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>: the example is wanting in W.) and *uganābhyaç trñhatibhyah* (iv.5.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the last word); *varshayanti cupunīkā nāmā* 'si (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: only W. has the first word, and it omits the last); *mantrine bāñijāya kakshānām pataye* (iv.5.2<sup>2</sup>: B. G. M. omit the first word, G.

11. 'tavarge pare' nakārah<sup>2</sup> prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah. çiti-  
----: kand- ---- tavargah paro yasmāt sa tathoktah.

(1) B. G. M. -rgaparah; O. -rgaparo vā. (2) G. M. put after 'va

12. cañkuna ----- eshu nakārah prakṛtyāi 'va veditavyah.  
avabh- ----: anv- ----: aya- ----: bhrāt- ----: evā ----: ra-  
jano- ----: ye ----: yajña ----: yatrāyatra çrutir uganāgraha-  
nasya<sup>1</sup> tatrātatra natvan karanīyam: 'avyā- ----: ugan- ----:  
varsh- ----: mantrine- ----: priy- ----: ce 'ti kim: anavas  
----: etam- ----: ya- ----: yā- ----: açloṇayā- ----: pane- ----:  
indram- ----: kalyāñi- ----: purushak- ----: vāñah- ----: çate  
'ti kim: 'rtāv- ----: çonā- ----: 'çrutir iti kim: çonāya- ----:  
ni- ----: vanas- ----: makāreṇa kim: ubhay- ----

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. put before *yatra*- (2) W. om. (3) O. om. (4) O. om.

pause of division, he gives (the whole subject is omitted in O.) *vrshann agne viçvāny aya ā* (iv.4.4<sup>4</sup>), *tasmāt saptuçirshan* (v.1.7<sup>1</sup>), *brahman viçam vi* (ii.3.3<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *vi*), *akshann amīmadanta* (i.8.5<sup>2</sup>), and *paçūnām carman* (vi.1.9<sup>2</sup>).

This disposes of all the *avagrahas* cited in the rule save *carshan*. No such *pada* as *carshan* is to be found in the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, nor, so far as has yet come to light, in any other Vedic text; nor does the word seem like one that could anywhere occur. One cannot help surmising that its presence in the rule may be by a blunder merely, it being, perhaps, an unintelligent repetition of *carman*. But, by whatever hap or mishap it found its way in, it is now an accepted part of the text, and has to be dealt with. And the commentator first creeps out of the difficulty through the hole to which he usually betakes himself in a like case, asserting that the passage aimed at is read in another text (*cākhā*). He then proceeds to state that "some quote as here referred to the passage *mitrasya carshanīdhrtah çravaḥ* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup> and iv.1.6<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *çravaḥ*): this is not good, since the words are quoted in the rule by way of antecedent exception to an exception [to rule 6] which is to be made farther on, by the words 'nor when final, nor by the omission of *a*' (rule 15); and in *carshanīdhrtah* the *n* is not final. Or: others are of opinion that the words in question are specified for the sake of removing any doubt which might arise as to whether the *n* in them were a product of alteration under rule 6 of this chapter; and, in this aspect, the citation of *mitrasya carshanīdhrtah* is to be approved." The logic of this final conclusion I entirely fail to see: for no question can possibly arise as to whether the *n* of *carshanīdhrtah* falls under rule 6; that it does so is palpable and undeniable.

As we should expect, considering the way in which the Prāticākhya treats the cases, these words are read with *n* in the *pada*-text also: namely *vrshan-vān*, *brahman-vantah*, and so on. The same is the case in the *pada*-texts of the Rik and the Atharvan (see Ath. Pr. iv.99).

## ऋषयसप्तान्पारावणा चेति प्राकृताः ॥ १४ ॥

14. Also in *ṛnn*, *shan*, *shn*, *mn*, and *rāv*—these are original.

The application of the term *prākṛtāḥ*, 'original,' in this rule is, as was pointed out above (under rule 9), to all the cases rehearsed in rules 9-14.

"*dīprāpter atra nakāro vāikṛta iti gaṅkānirākuraṇārtham etāni grahaṇāni 'ty anye' manyante: tathā sati mitrasya carshanīdhrtā ity udāharanaṁ ramanīyam.* <sup>10</sup>*avagraha* <sup>11</sup>*iti kim: vrshann* ----: *tasmāt* ----: *brahman* ----: *akshann* ----: *paçūnām* ----: *avagrahastho* <sup>12</sup>*'cagraha iti lakshyate.* <sup>10</sup>

<sup>1</sup> W. -*ne*; G. M. -*diṣhu gr*-. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>(3)</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> W. -*shan*-. <sup>(5)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>6</sup> W. -*haranaṁ*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. om. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *ṛkāra*. <sup>9</sup> B. *anena*. <sup>(10)</sup> O. om. <sup>11</sup> W. -*ha*-*sthā*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. put next before *lakshyate*.

themes (*aryaman*, *-krāvan*, *grāvan*), a "loss of *a*" (*alopa*): compare what is said of this *alopa* below.

As regards the application of the term *prākṛta*, 'original,' their discordance is more essential, and, indeed, irreconcilable. In *tr̥nna*, to be sure, the cerebral *n*'s are as original as in the words specified by rule 13, since, in all alike, the alteration is an accomplished fact in all the forms of text, although ultimately referable to the cause laid down in rule 6. But the last three cases, although also read alike in all texts, are introduced here as counter-exceptions to rule 15, and their *n* is no more original than is that of any other of the words falling under rule 6. And finally, there is no sense whatever in which the lingual nasals of *-shan̄a* are "original." To call them all original, then, seems even more than a looseness or inaccuracy in the use of that term: it is a blunder.

The commentator perceives the difficulty, and attempts to remove it by a lengthy passage of special pleading. The term *prākṛta*, he says, is *mukhya*, 'of primary value' or 'of full force,' as applied to the words beginning with *pāni* (rule 9) and ending with *carshan̄* (rule 13), since in them the lingualized nasal is found in all the four *saṁhitās*; but in *r̥nn* and the rest it is not *mukhya*, but is simply intended to authorize the nasalization even in the absence of a rule prescribing it. Thus, namely: in *r̥nn* etc. (i. e. in *r̥nn* and *shan̄n*), the first nasal constitutes an exception (under rule 6) as being followed by a mute (rule 15); the other nasal, as having a *ṭ*-mute between it and the altering cause (rule 15). In *sh̄n* and *m̄n*, again [why not in *rāvn̄*?], the nasal falls under the exception touching the loss of *a* (rule 15). And if it be objected that the lingualization is assured by the competency of the citation—'still [it is answered], the implication is avoided that the occasion of the citation is the originality of the *n* [?]. Moreover, the word *ca*, 'also,' in the rule, being used in the sense of subsidiary adjunction (*anvācaya*), shows the lingualization to be not of primary value; if it were primary, it would be found in all the four kinds of text; but it is not so found; for we read in *pada*-text *abhishanna ity abhi-sannaḥ* and *nishan̄ṇāye 'ti ni-sannāya*. And since, from the words *pūshan* and *aryaman*, which end in *n*, such forms as *pūshṇo rañhyāi* and *aryamne carum* are read in the *varṇa*-text, therefore the conversion into *n̄* (all but O. say "non-conversion into *n̄*") in

<sup>11</sup>*itarasyo 'ttamasya*<sup>11</sup> *ṭavargīyavyavahitatvāt*<sup>12</sup>: *sh̄namnagraha-*  
*nayos tv alopād iti nishedhaḥ. grahaṇasām̄rthyād eva*<sup>13</sup> *natvam*  
*sidhyati 'ti cet: evaṁ svabhdvatvam eva grahaṇasyā 'pi*<sup>14</sup> *mālam*  
*iti parihārah. kin̄ ca: anvācaye*<sup>15</sup> *vartumānaḥ cakāro 'py eteshu*  
*natvam amukhyam*<sup>16</sup> *iti dyotayati: mukhyam*<sup>17</sup> *cet: catasṛshu*  
*saṁhitāsu vidyeta*<sup>18</sup>: *na cā 'tra vidyate: tathā hi: abhishanna*  
*ity abhi-sannaḥ: nishan̄ṇāye 'ti ni-sannāya: ity atra*<sup>19</sup>  
*padasaṁhitāyām: pūshann aryamann iti nakārantagabda-*  
*yoh: pūshṇo rañhyāi: aryamne carum: ity ādi siddharū-*  
*patvāt*<sup>20</sup> *atra varṇasaṁhitāyām etatsāhacaryād ekasūtrasthāyor*<sup>21</sup>

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushumnāḥ śūryaraçmiḥ* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), *indrāgnibhyām tvā sayujā* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *sayujā*; the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmānīto abhayaṁ jyotiḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: only *Ō*. has *jyotiḥ*; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yushmā-nītaḥ*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) and *pra mṛṇīhi çatrān* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vrtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vrtraghna indrāya tvā* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>: *Ō*. omits the example) and *vrtraghna stomāḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>)—for the derivative adjective *vārttraghna* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prāṭicākhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shn*, *mn*, and *rāvn*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samānapade*, 'within the limits of the same *pada*,' while in *vrtra-ghnaḥ* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, 'a lion's look'), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samānapade* is not in force: *ghnaḥ* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

15. *shumnāḥ*<sup>1</sup>: *agniḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *yushmānītaḥ*: *eteshu*<sup>3</sup> *nakāro natvaṁ nā* "padyate: *sush*-----: *indrā*-----: *yushm*-----: *antaḥ*<sup>4</sup> *padānto nakāro natvaṁ nā* "padyate: *pitṛn*-----: *pra*-----: *alopād akāralopāt*<sup>5</sup> *puro* 'pi *nakāro natvaṁ nā* "padyate: 'vrtra-----: *vrtra*-----: *nanv atra nimittanimittinor bhinnapadaasthatvād vishamo drśhtāntaḥ*: *satyam*: *siṅhāvalokananyāyena*<sup>7</sup> *prathamapraçne*<sup>8</sup> *saptamādhyāye*<sup>9</sup> *çeshodāharanarūpeṇa*<sup>10</sup> *ghaṭate*: *tatra ca samānapadanīyamo*<sup>11</sup> *nā* 'sti: *ghna ity asya haṇçabdavikṛtatvād*<sup>12</sup> <sup>13</sup>*raṣaḥpārvo havanī*<sup>13</sup> (vii.11) 'ti *prāptiḥ*. <sup>14</sup>*sparçaparo nakāraç ca*<sup>15</sup> *natvaṁ nā* "pnoti"<sup>16</sup>: *saṁkr*-----: *ava*-----

Under the first part of the rule, the passages aimed at are quoted as follows: *sushumnah sūryaraçmih* (iii.4.7<sup>1</sup>), *indrāgniḥbhyām tvā sayujā* (iv.4.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit *sayujā*; the *pada*-reading is doubtless *indrāgni-bhyām*, so that the *r* and *n* are *samānapade*, as required by rule 6), and *yushmānito abhayaṁ jyotiḥ* (ii.1.11<sup>6</sup>: only *Ō*. has *jyotiḥ*; from its inclusion here, the word must remain undivided in *pada*-text, though in that of the Rig-Veda [ii.27.11] it is read *yushmā-nītaḥ*).

Examples of final *n* not lingualized are *pitṛn havishe attave* (i.6.12<sup>1</sup>) and *pra mr̥ṇīhi çatrān* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>).

The precept touching the omission of an *a* has reference, so far as I can discover, only to the oblique cases of *vrtrahan*, of which two (and I have failed to note any others) are cited, namely *vrtraghna indrāya tvā* (i.4.1<sup>1</sup>: *Ō*. omits the example) and *vrtraghna stomāḥ* (iv.7.15<sup>1</sup>)—for the derivative adjective *vātraghna* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) can hardly be aimed at; and yet, the authority of this rule is needed to establish the dental *n* in this word also, which would otherwise fall under rule xiii.6. The mode of definition of the cases here intended is in very remarkable contrast with the usage elsewhere of the treatise, which, as has been repeatedly pointed out, differs from the other Prāṭicākhyas especially in avoiding all reference to grammatical categories, forms, and derivations, and defining the words to which its rules relate simply by external circumstances of position and surroundings in the text. And this departure from its custom is a quite unfortunate and ill-judged one: for, in the first place, it renders necessary a part of the specifications of the preceding rule (namely *shn*, *m̐n*, and *rāv̐n*), which really lie outside the province of the treatise, and have no good reason to be mentioned; and, in the second place, as the commentator points out, it involves an inconsistency with the general subject of the chapter, which has to do with conversions arising *samānapade*, ‘within the limits of the same *pada*,’ while in *vrtra-ghnaḥ* etc. the affecting cause is in one *pada* and the nasal to be affected in another. The commentator explains that the intent is, by a far-reaching glance backward (literally, ‘a lion’s look’), to lay down a further example to a rule in the seventh chapter, where the restriction *samānapade* is not in force: *ghnaḥ* etc., namely, are altered forms of *han*, whose

15. *shumnah*<sup>1</sup>: *agniḥ*<sup>2</sup>: *yushmānītaḥ*: *eteshu*<sup>3</sup> *nakāro ṇatvaṁ nā* ”*padyate*: *sush*-----: *indrā*-----: *yushm*-----: *antaḥ*<sup>4</sup> *padānto nakāro ṇatvaṁ nā* ”*padyate*: *pitṛn*-----: *pra*-----: *alopād akāralopāt*<sup>5</sup> *paro* ”*pi nakāro ṇatvaṁ nā* ”*padyate*: ”*vrtra*-----: ”*vrtra*-----: *nanv atra nīmittanīmittinor bhīnnapadasthatvād vishamo dr̥sh̥tāntaḥ*: *satyam*: *siṅhāvalokananyāyena*<sup>7</sup> *prathamapracne*<sup>8</sup> *saptamādhyāye*<sup>9</sup> *çeshodāharanarāpeṇa*<sup>10</sup> *ghatate*: *tatra ca samānapadaniyam*<sup>11</sup> *nā* ’*sti*: *ghna ity asya haṇçabdavikrtatvād*<sup>12</sup> *rashahpārvo havan*<sup>13</sup> (vii.11) *’ti prāptiḥ*. <sup>14</sup> *sparcaparo nakāraç ca*<sup>15</sup> *ṇatvaṁ nā* ”*pnoti*<sup>16</sup>: *samkr*-----: *ava*-----

an intervening *ç* or *s*, or a palatal, lingual, or dental mute: namely *raçanām ā datte* (vi.3.6<sup>3</sup>), *agne rasena tejasā* (i.4.46<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *tejasā*), *rocante rocana divi* (vii.4.20: O. omits *rocante*), *somañ rājanam* (i.7.10<sup>1</sup> et al.), *prakṛidinaḥ payodhāḥ* (iv.3.13<sup>7</sup>), *pṛtanā jayāmi* (iii.5.3<sup>1,2</sup>), and *janaprathanāya svāhā* (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *svāhā*; G. M. have the false reading *pradha-*, and O. has dropped out a part of the word, giving *janandya*).

In the note to Ath. Pr. iii.94, I have pointed out the physical reason why these sounds, by their interposition, prevent the lingualization of the nasal: they are, all of them, such as call into action for their utterance the tip of the tongue, throwing it out of adjustment for the lingual contact. The tendency which the history of Aryan language in India exhibits toward the conversion of dentals into linguals shows itself most actively in the case of the nasal: the tongue, being rolled back into the position of lingual articulation by the utterance of *r*, *ṛ*, *ṛ*, or *sh*, hangs suspended there, as it were, and makes the next nasal contact lingual, unless the tendency is satisfied by the intermediate production of such a contact, or frustrated by the transfer elsewhere of the articulating organ.

The Prāṭiśākhya's enumeration of the cases of occurrence of the lingual nasal is, so far as I have been able to determine, complete. No one of the other treatises undertakes such an enumeration.

## पृक्तस्वरात्परो लो उं पौष्करसादेः पौष्करसादेः ॥ १६ ॥

16. In the opinion of Pāuṣhkarasādi, *l* after a mixed vowel becomes *ḍ*.

The mention of Pāuṣhkarasādi (O. has everywhere Pāuṣkarasādi), the commentator says, is out of respect, and not because the rule is not a peremptory one. "Mixed vowel" is a term which is not elsewhere employed by the treatise, nor does the latter contain anything that should intimate an explanation of its meaning. The comment glosses it by 'the sound *r*.' it appears, then, that *r* is thus styled, from having its vocalic quality "mixed" with consonantal, namely, with the *r*-sound. The other Prāṭiśākhyas (see

*satsu nakāro natvaṁ nā padyate: yathā*<sup>22</sup>: *raçanām*----: *agne*----: *rocante*----: *somañ*----: *prakṛi*----: *pṛtanā* ----: *jana*----: *ṛkārarkār* (xiii.5) "*diprāpteh*"<sup>33</sup> *pratishedho*<sup>34</sup> 'yam vihitah.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. O. *sumnah*; G. M. *sushumnah*. <sup>2</sup> W. O. *agnī*. <sup>3</sup> O. *eshu*; G. M. *eshu grahaneshu*. <sup>4</sup> W. B. *tatah*. <sup>5</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *-kanena*. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *-yāya*. <sup>10</sup> W. O. *viçesh-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *-datvani-*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-bdādihik-*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *dr̥ṣṭah pūvo bhavati*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *sparçaparāh*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. om. <sup>16</sup> G. M. "*padyate*". <sup>17</sup> B. G. M. *tra*. <sup>18</sup> B. *-viçeshayor*. <sup>19</sup> O. *vikshyate*; G. M. *pi vā yujyate*. <sup>20</sup> W. B. *yathā*; G. M. *athā 'pi*. <sup>21</sup> O. *-ddha*; W. *pratisiddha*. <sup>22</sup> W. *ce 'ti*; O. om. <sup>23</sup> O. om. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. ins. *ca*. <sup>25</sup> W. O. *etal*. <sup>26</sup> B. *sūtravy-*; G. M. *sūtre vy-*. <sup>27</sup> G. M. *spashtik-*. <sup>28</sup> W. *pūvo*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. ins. *vyavāyishu*. <sup>30</sup> B. ins. *vyavāyeshu*. <sup>31</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>32</sup> in W. only. <sup>33</sup> G. M. *-tiḥ*. <sup>34</sup> W. O. *pratinish-*.

sion') of the rule founded on the authority of the grammarians, who assert a homogeneousness of the *duhgliṣṭa* *l* and of the *ḍ*, as being both produced in the lingual position: and if the question is raised as to how it is so founded, reference is made to a rule of Pāṇini (i.1.50), which prescribes that, in case of substitution, the most nearly related letter is to be taken. I do not see that this exposition and reference have any pertinence whatever.

Then, the commentator adds yet another interpretation, which, he remarks, is also highly esteemed. It differs from the one already given only in implying (apparently, from xiii.6) *saṁānapade*, 'within the limits of a single *padu*;' taking, then, a different example, *te no mṛdayantu* (iv.4.3<sup>2</sup> et al.), with the counter-example *ilāṁdam bhavati* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>)—which, in view of the frequent occurrence in the Sanhitā of *idā*, *idāvant*, and their like, is not much to the point—and finally, as further counter-example, to justify the restriction *saṁānapade*, the phrase *pitṛlokaṁ somena* (ii.6.2<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitṛ-lokam*), where the *l* does not become *ḍ* after *ṛ*. But in this last case is involved an additional difficulty; namely, that in the compound *pitṛloka-kāmasya* (vi.6.4<sup>1</sup>; p. *pitṛloka-kāmasya*) the *ṛ* and *l* do meet *saṁānapade*, and yet the *l* maintains itself: over this, the commentator hobbles as best he may, with the plea that, prohibition having been made in the case of *pitṛloka*, it is extended by association to the further compound.

The groundlessness and unintelligence of all this special pleading, resorted to for the purpose of forcing in as an integral part of the Prātiçākhyā a precept altogether foreign to it, is palpable enough; and one grudges the time and words spent in its exposure.

*svarād ṛkārāt<sup>22</sup> paro lakāro ḍakāram āpadyate. yathā<sup>23</sup>: te.....*  
*prkṭasvarād iti kim: ilāṁ-----: saṁānapada iti kim: pitṛl-*  
*----- saḥucāritvād<sup>24</sup> ekasya<sup>25</sup> nishiddha<sup>26</sup> itarasyā<sup>27</sup> pi pitṛloka-*  
*kāmasye<sup>21</sup> 'ty asyā<sup>28</sup> 'pi<sup>29</sup> saṁānapadatve suty api nishedho bha-*  
*vati. idam api pāthānturam bahvādr̥tam.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarāṇe*  
*trayodaço<sup>29</sup> 'dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om. <sup>2</sup> B. om.; G. M. *lo dam*. <sup>3</sup> all but B. *duḥl*; B. *jñako*; O. *jño*; G. M. *jñakam*. <sup>4</sup> O. everywhere *pauska*-. <sup>5</sup> W. *-tena*; B. *-tan*. <sup>6</sup> B. *-vad*. <sup>7</sup> B. *iti* 'ti. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. *-di*. <sup>9</sup> W. om. <sup>10</sup> all but B. *duḥl*; W. B. *-shtadalak*-.; O. *-lakāra-ḍak*-.; G. M. *-ṭadākār*-. <sup>11</sup> O. *sadr̥ṣyasam̐jño ḍakāram*. <sup>12</sup> W. *-sārāt*; G. M. *-sāra*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *ucyate*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. ins. *varṇānām*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. O. *-mas sadṛṣatama*. <sup>16</sup> W. *asya*; O. *sūtra*. <sup>17</sup> B. *iti*. <sup>18</sup> B. ins. *iti*. <sup>19</sup> O. *-sāda ity*; G. M. *ity* only. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-dasya*, and om. *ity asya*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. ins. *pakshe*. <sup>22</sup> W. om. <sup>23</sup> O. om. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. *-caritativ*-. <sup>25</sup> O. *-sm̐n*. <sup>26</sup> B. *nishedha*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *-kasye*; G. M. *-lokamasye*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. O. om. *api*. <sup>29</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiye praçne prathamō*.

The commentator offers a single example, *uru prathasva*, i. e. *uru pprathassva* (i.1.8 et al.: the MSS. of the comment only very rarely and irregularly write the groups in their duplicated form, so as to illustrate the rules of the chapter), and adds counter-examples: first, to show that the consonant is liable to duplication only after a vowel, *tat pravāte* (vi.4.7<sup>2</sup>: hardly a well-chosen example, since, though the *p* of *pra* is this time unchanged, the *t* before it must be doubled, *tatt pr-*; a *pra* after a pause would have answered better); second, that the duplication takes place only before a consonant, *urukrd uru nah* (ii.6.11<sup>3</sup>); third, that only a consonant, not a vowel, in the defined position, is duplicated, *prāṅgam uktham* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>). O. appends a new set of counter-examples, as if a part of a new exposition; namely *prajānanam* (i.5.9<sup>1</sup>), *padbhyām dve savane* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>: an ill-chosen example, containing cases of duplication as well as of its omission), and *ugāṇ uta* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>).

## लवकारपूर्व स्पर्शश्च पौष्करसदिः ॥ २ ॥

2. Likewise, according to Pāuṣhkarasādi, a mute preceded by *l* or *v*.

The commentator declares that the *ca*, 'likewise,' in this rule brings down from the one preceding the being preceded by a vowel, and duplication. The former part of the defined implication is at least otiose, since *l* and *v* never occur in the Sanhitā before a mute, except as themselves preceded by a vowel: *v*, indeed, is found in combination only with the nasal mutes, *n* and *ṇ*; *l*, in the groups *lk*, *lg*, *lp*, *lb*, *lbh*, *lm*, and *lpy*. The examples quoted are *kalpāṇ juhoti* (v.4.8<sup>5</sup>) and *vibhādāṇe* (iii.5.8<sup>1,9,2</sup>: all save B. actually read this time *-dāṇne*, with doubled *n*). According to the interpretation given to the next rule, the worthy Pāuṣhkarasādi does not regard the duplication of the mute after the semivowel as suspending the duplication of its predecessor also, by rule 1; and he would accordingly read *kallppāṇ* and *-dāṇne*; and this part of his doctrine is, as we shall see, declared unapproved.

Counter-examples are given: *kalyāṇī rūpasamrddhā* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>: to be pronounced *kallyāṇī*, or, by rule 21, *kalyāṇī*) and *vāyavyam* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> et al.: to be made *vāyavyam*), to show that no other letter than a mute is thus doubled; and *kāc māñ cakubhāñ* (v.7.23) and *tasmād etat* (vi.3.11<sup>6</sup>), instancing other consonants than *l* and *v*, with the following mute not doubled: in these words, the sibilant

2. *pāuṣhkarasāder<sup>1</sup> mate lakarapūrvō<sup>2</sup> vakārapūrvō vā sparṣo<sup>3</sup> dvivarnam āpadyate<sup>3</sup>. kalpāṇ-... vibh-... svarapūrvatvam dvitvaṁ cā 'nvāḍiṣati cakāraḥ<sup>4</sup>. 'sparṣa<sup>5</sup> iti kim: kaly-...: vāy-... evampūrvā iti kim: kāṣ-...: tasm-...<sup>6</sup> lakāraḥ-ca vakāraḥ ca lavakārāu<sup>7</sup>: tāu pūrvāu yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. *pauṣkar-*, as also in the rule. <sup>2</sup> B. G. M. ins. *vā*. <sup>3</sup> O. *dvitvam āpnoti*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. put at beginning of clause. <sup>5</sup> O. om. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sparṣapara*. <sup>7</sup> W. O. *lakāraḥ*.



i. e. *arccanty arkkam arkkinaḥ*), *arkyena vāi* (vii.5.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *arkk-yeṇa*: wanting in O.), and *ūrg vā udumbaraḥ* (v.1.10<sup>1</sup> et al.: i. e. *ūrgg vāi*).

The *ca*, 'also,' of the rule, according to the commentator, implies duplication, and precedence of the *r* by a vowel (bringing down *svarapūrva* from rule 1). The question is raised by an objector whether sequence of the consonant following the *r* by another consonant (in virtue of *vyāñjanaparam* in rule 1) is not also implied: but such sequence is declared not obligatory; and it is pointed out that later rules (15,16), exempting a consonant *in paisā*, and a spirant before a vowel, from duplication after *r*, prove that the present rule prescribes duplication also where no consonant follows, and where a vowel follows; since there would be no propriety in denying by a special rule what had not been already enjoined by a general rule. In support of his assertion that the *r* must be preceded by a vowel, the commentator cites the word *tryambakam* (i.8.6<sup>2</sup>), in which he says that the *y* must not be doubled: and he fortifies his claim by appealing to Pāṇini's rule (viii.4.46), which expressly restricts duplication after *r* and *h* to cases in which these letters follow a vowel (G. M. add the remark that in Pāṇini also no implication of *vyāñjanaparam*, 'followed by a consonant,' is found). The Vāj. Pr. (iv.102) makes an equivalent restriction explicitly. The groups are not numerous in the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā in which a *r* that does not stand first is followed by a consonant, and the only consonant so following is *y*: the combinations are *jry*, *try*, *ñtry*, *ttry*, *ntry*, *stry*, and *tstry*.

This finishes the proper exposition and illustration of the rule; but the commentator suffers himself to be enticed into a lengthy and tedious refutation of a trivial suggestion which some one has been impertinent enough to make. There are those, he says, who

4. *rephāt param*<sup>1</sup> *vyāñjanam* *dvivarnam āpadyate*<sup>2</sup>: *yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *arc-----*: *arky-----*<sup>4</sup> *ūrg-----* *svarapūrvadvitvayor ākar-shakaḥ cakārah*. *nanu*<sup>5</sup> *vyāñjanuparatvākarshakaḥ kiṁ na syāt*: *ne 'ti brūmaḥ*: *niyamābhāvat*: *tathā hi*: *avasāne*<sup>7</sup> (xiv.15) *āśhmā svarapara* (xiv.16) *ity etannishedhudvayena rephāt pa-rasya*<sup>8</sup> *vyāñjanasya*<sup>9</sup> *vyāñjanuparatvābhāve*<sup>10</sup> *svarapūrvatve*<sup>11</sup> *'pi dvitvam asti 'ti nigcīyate*<sup>12</sup>: *aprasaktapratishedhānupapatteḥ*<sup>13</sup>. *svarapūrvatvānvādeṇa*<sup>14</sup> *kim*: *tryambakam ity ādāu mā bhūd iti*: *kim ca*: *aco rahābhyām dve iti*<sup>15</sup> *pāṇinīyasātrenā* *'pi svarapūrvatve saty eva*<sup>16</sup> *dvitvam vidhīyate*: *'tisyā*<sup>18</sup> *'yam arthaḥ*: *aco uttarāu yāu rephahakārāu tābhyām uttarasya yaro dve bhavata*<sup>19</sup> *iti*.<sup>20</sup>

*kecid evam ūcuh*<sup>21</sup>: *svarapūrvādiḥ abhavad rephapūrvam iti vācye*<sup>22</sup> *vāco*<sup>23</sup> *yuktyantaram arthāntaram samarthayati*<sup>24</sup>: *ahar ---- ity ādāu*<sup>25</sup> *vāikṛtarephād*<sup>26</sup> *uttarasya*<sup>27</sup> *na syād dvitvam*<sup>27</sup> *iti*. *tad etadudhyayanaviruddhapaddhatim adhyāste*<sup>28</sup>: *vayam tu va-*

## द्वितीयचतुर्थयोस्तु व्यञ्जनोत्तरयोः पूर्वः ॥ ५ ॥

5. In place, however, of second and fourth mutes, when followed by consonants, is put the preceding mute.

That is to say, when an aspirate occurs between a preceding vowel (as the commentator specifies in his paraphrase of the rule) and a following consonant, or in such circumstances that by rule 1 it would be doubled, it receives instead an increment (*āgama*) of the mute next preceding it in its own series, or of its corresponding non-aspirate. Examples are *vikhyāya* (i. e. *vikkhyāya*) *cakshushū tvam* (iv.1.2<sup>3</sup>: only G. M. have the last two words) and *meghyā* (i. e. *megghyā*) *vidyuto vācah* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>: only G. M. have *vācah*); to which W. B. add *tat savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.; the *t* is converted to *th* by xiv.12, and to the *th* is then prefixed *t*, making *tatth savituh*) and *sādhyā* (i. e. *sāddhyā*) *vāi devāh* (vi.3.4<sup>8</sup> et al.). To show that only the aspirates are thus treated, is quoted *ādyam* (i. e. *ād-dyam*) *asyā 'nnam* (ii.2.5<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *annam*); to show that a vowel must precede, *vashat svāhā* (vii.3.12; by v.33, *t* is inserted between *t* and *s*, and the inserted letter is made *th* by xiv.12; then, by this rule, no farther change of the *th* occurs, and we read *vashattth*, not *vashattttth*; W. goes so far on this road as to read *vashath svāhā*) and *padbhyām* (i. e. *padābhyām*, not *padābhyām*) *dve savane* (vi.1.6<sup>4</sup>)—but G. M. O. substitute for the former another similar case, *vat svayamabhiḡartāya* (iii.2.8<sup>1</sup> seven times: i. e. *vattth sv*; O. writes *vatth sv*)—; to show that a consonant must follow, *ukhāyāi sadane sve* (iv.1.9<sup>3</sup> et al.: W. B. omit *sve*) and *meghāyate svāhā* (vii.5.11<sup>1</sup>). The word *tu*, 'however,' in the rule, the commentator (with more than his usual success in dealing with this particle) explains as intimating the denial of duplication, enjoined by rule 1. He adds that some give the particle a different interpretation, as

5. *dvitīyacaturthayoḥ<sup>1</sup> svarapūrvayor vyañjanottarayoh<sup>2</sup> pūrvā-gamo bhavati: yathākrameṇa dvitīyasya prathamāṣ caturthasya tṛtīyah. yathā<sup>3</sup>: vi-----: me-----: 'tat-----: sā-----<sup>4</sup> dvitī-yacaturthayor iti kim: ādyam----- evampūrvā<sup>5</sup> iti kim: va-shat-----: pad-----: evamparayor<sup>6</sup> iti kim: ukh-----: megh-----: prathamusūtreṇa prasaktam dvitvaṁ nivartayati tuḡubdah. anye tv anyathā manyante: pūrvāgumasya dvitvaṁ nivartayati 'ti. nāi 'tat sāram: savarṇasavarḡyapara (xiv.23) ity uttaranishedhād<sup>7</sup> eva tasya tannivṛttiḥ<sup>1</sup>.*

*atra kecid āhuḥ: vyañjanaparayor iti vācye<sup>8</sup> vāco yuktyanta-ram arthāntaram ūcayati<sup>9</sup>: sāmhitāsāmhitasādāhāraṇam<sup>10</sup> para-nimittam<sup>11</sup> uktam<sup>12</sup>: tata<sup>13</sup> ihā 'nyatarastha<sup>14</sup> āgamaninittatve prāpte 'sāmhitapadānām nityatvāt tadgrahaṇam<sup>15</sup> eva<sup>16</sup> nyāyayam iti kṛtvā vāikṛtavyañjanaparatve sati nāi 'tad vidhānam bhavati<sup>17</sup>: yathā: abhy asthād ity ādi. nā 'yam pakshaḥ: adhyayana-*

rule. For, the intent is to cast out or deny a duplication established by the fundamental rule (xiv.1), where the being preceded by a vowel and followed by a consonant was implied; and there no limitation was laid down for the following consonant; hence, it is improper to lay one down here, where an exception is prescribed.

The commentator then goes on to say that he will set forth the real intent of the difference of phraseology, with due regard to the *Ḍikshā*, and in accordance with the accepted reading of the text. But I am compelled to confess myself incapable of extracting a satisfactory meaning from his exposition and argument. The point of it is an asserted absence of *niyama* in the two rules (1 and 5), as of one suffering and the other prescribing exception. *Niyama*, 'obligatory force,' appears to signify here joint application, and so a mutual or reciprocal influence. When a vowel precedes, he continues, a consonant is doubled only when followed by a consonant; and second and fourth mutes take increment of the mute that stands before them in the alphabet only when followed by a consonant. But the pair of rules in question is constructed with the intent of multiplicity ('diversity' or 'independence') *prācurya* is not found elsewhere). How does an absence of *niyama* appear? Why, from the fact that otherwise a twofold effect would in some cases come to light. In *attā havīṣhi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>) and in *annapate* (iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.), and so on, there is duplication; in *prachac chandah* (iv.3.12<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have instead *acchāvākah*, the reference for which I have failed to note) and *addhi tvam deva prayatā* (ii.6.12<sup>5</sup>: G. M. O. omit *prayatā*), and so on, there is increment of a preceding mute; but in *tān haste* (vi.1.3<sup>7</sup>: W. has *tāns te* [iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>], but doubtless by accidental omission of *ha*), even though it falls under the rule, the same effect is not seen: hence, there is

*svarāt<sup>40</sup> pūrvasya<sup>41</sup> varṇasya kvaciḍ dvitvaṁ ca kathyate<sup>42</sup>;  
na ca varṇadvitīyasya na caturthe kadā<sup>43</sup> cana.*

*vyākhyātāṁ ca vacanam etadvidvadbhiḥ:*

*kutrācit svarayor madhye dvitvaṁ lakṣhyānusūtrataḥ:*

*pūrvāgamas tathā tatra jñeyo varṇavicakṣaṇāḥ.*

<sup>44</sup> *evamrūpam aniyamaṁ sūcayitūṁ vyañjanottaraḥ<sup>45</sup> ity anta-  
rasvīkārah<sup>46</sup>.*

*vyañjanam uttaraṁ yābhyān tāt<sup>47</sup> vyañjanottarāu<sup>48</sup>: tayoh.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. put next before *pūrv-*, O. adding *tu*. <sup>2</sup> in O. only. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. om.   
<sup>4</sup> G. M. O. *svarapūrvayor*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *vyañjanottarayor*. <sup>6</sup> B. *utaratran-*; G. M. *uttarasūtrani-*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. *-tēh-*; O. om. *tan*. <sup>8</sup> B. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. *-ti 'i*; G. M. add *tatra*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *saṁhitāsāṁh-*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *paramani-*; O. *uktani-*. <sup>12</sup> O. om.   
<sup>13</sup> O. *tatra*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-rasya*. <sup>15</sup> W. O. om. *tad*; B. *gunam*. <sup>16</sup> W. O. *evam*; M. exchanges the places of *eva* and *iti*. <sup>17</sup> O. *-ti 'i*. <sup>18</sup> O. om. *sūtra*. <sup>19</sup> O. *-namā-  
trapar-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-ta*; O. puts after *dvitvam*, and adds *ity*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *nishidhyate*; O. *viśidhyate*. <sup>22</sup> W. B. O. *nu*. <sup>23</sup> W. B. *tatr-*. <sup>24</sup> G. M. *yuktah*. <sup>25</sup> W. *-āpavāca-  
ksh-*; G. M. *-ṇa*. <sup>26</sup> O. *abhiḥkṣi-*. <sup>27</sup> W. B. *apavādāp-*. <sup>28</sup> G. M. *nā 'sti vīrodha  
iti*. <sup>29</sup> O. *paramaṁ*. <sup>30</sup> W. om. <sup>31</sup> O. ins. *svrapūrv-*. <sup>32</sup> B. *tu*; O. om. <sup>33</sup> O. *parāv*. <sup>34</sup> W. *-me*; G. M. *-māu*. <sup>35</sup> B. G. M. ins. *pi*. <sup>36</sup> G. M. ins. *katham*. <sup>37</sup> W. *B-mam*. <sup>38</sup> O. om. <sup>39</sup> W. om. <sup>40</sup> O. *-ra*. <sup>41</sup> W. *saṁvasya*. <sup>42</sup> G. M. *vatkhyate*.   
<sup>43</sup> G. M. *katham*. <sup>44</sup> O. ins. *ity*. <sup>45</sup> O. *-janayor*. <sup>46</sup> G. M. O. *uttarasv-*. <sup>47</sup> G. M. *tad*. <sup>48</sup> G. M. *-raṁ*.

7. And when *l* precedes.

The *ca*, 'and,' here brings down from rule 5 only the fourth mute [the last of the two there mentioned] and the increment. The second mute is not also included, because (see note to rule 2) no second mute occurs after *l* in the Sanhitā. The examples are *pragalbho* (i. e. *-galbbho*) 'sya *jáyate* (ii.5.5<sup>2</sup>: only G. M. have *jáyate*), and *namo madhyamāya cā pagalbhāya* (i. e. *-galbbh-*) *ca* (iv.5.6<sup>1</sup>)—but, in place of the latter, G. M. give *apagalbho jáyate* (ii.5.5<sup>3</sup>: O. reads *agagalya* simply, which doubtless means the first word of this).

As was remarked above (under rule 3), the laying down of the present precept without any limitation appears to confirm the commentator's interpretation of rules 2 and 3, as teaching the accepted doctrine of the *śākhā*. It would, to be sure, be not impossible to understand *lbbh* for *lbh* as required here, without any reference to the other groups—*lk*, *lg* etc.—in which the duplication after *l* depends upon the earlier rules; but that seems quite unlikely.

उपसर्गपाथेष्वोऽत्यातिधामपरमभूतेपूर्वेषु ह्रस्विभुजेषु

च ॥ ८ ॥

8. Also the preceding mute is inserted before *ch*, *khi*, and *bhuja*, when these follow either a preposition, *pātha eshaḥ*, *ati*, *āti*, *dhāma*, *parāma*, or *bhūte*.

The examples after a preposition (in which situation alone the increment of *khi* and *bhuja* is made) are first given by the commentator: they are *ā cchṛnatti* (v.1.7<sup>4</sup>: the preceding word, *andcchṛnam*, might well have been included, as an additional instance; my MS. has simple *ch* in both cases); *nama ākṣhidate ca prakṣhidate ca* (iv.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit the first word, G. M. O. the last two); *ayakṣmayā paribbhujā* (iv.5.1<sup>4</sup>), with *vibhu ca me prabhu ca me* (iv.7.4<sup>1-2</sup>: O. stops at the first *me*) as counter-example, to show the necessity of saying *bhuja*, instead of *bhu* simply, in the rule; and *yā ca vicchandāḥ* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). Then follow counter-examples: first, to show that *kh* is increased only when followed by *i*, *nikhātam manushyāndm* (vi.3.4<sup>6</sup>) and *datṣv adhi khādati* (vi.2.11<sup>4</sup>: only G. M. have *datṣv*); next, to show that the increment takes place only after a preposition, *sachandā yā* (v.2.11<sup>1</sup>). The examples after the remaining words, as particularly specified in the rule, are *priyam apy etu pāthah: esha cchāgah* (iv.6.8<sup>1</sup>: only O. has *priyam*), with *ṛtubhir vā esha chandobhik* (vii.5.15<sup>2</sup>), to prove the need of quoting *pāthah* along with *esha* in the rule; *aticchan-*

7. *cakāraḥ caturthāgamayor<sup>1</sup> ākarshakaḥ: caturthasparṣe<sup>2</sup> lakārapūrve sati pūrvāgamo bhavati. prag-----: namo----- lakārah pūrvo yasmād asū<sup>3</sup> lakārapūrvah: tasmin.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -gam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -the sp- <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. sa.

that in the Rik Pr. (vi.2) which allows, but does not require, duplication of a mute after the spirants (namely *ç, sh, s, h, z, ç, ñ*). The Ath. Pr. (unless such a precept is lost by the *lacuna* occurring in the treatment of this subject: see note to Ath. Pr. iii. 28) and Pāṇini have nothing similar. Our rule, however, is quite alone so far as the treatment of a nasal after a spirant is concerned, making an insertion of a surd non-aspirate, instead of a nasal: and, as will be seen, the next rule quotes an opinion which would bring the Tāittirīya usage more nearly into accordance with that of the Rik and Vājasaneyi Sanhitās; but the commentator pronounces that opinion unapproved.

The examples quoted are as follows: *yah kāmayeta* (i. e. *yaz kkām-*: ii.1.2<sup>3</sup> et al.); *açmann* (i. e. *açpman*, or, after all rules are applied, *açpp̄man*) *urjam* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the example and puts here, instead of below, that for *ç*); *grishme* (i. e. *grishpme* or *grishshp̄pme*) *madhyandine* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>); *ayasmayan* (i. e. *ayaspma-yam* or *ayassp̄pmayam*) *vi cṛtā bandham* (iv.2.5<sup>3</sup>: only W. has *bandham*); *yah pāpmanā* (i. e. *yap ppā-*: ii.3.13<sup>2</sup>): O. adds to this last *tasmin* (vii.1.5<sup>1</sup> et al.: to be treated like *ayasmayam*, above), and, after *madhyandine*, *prā'çnāti* (*prāççtīnāti*: I have overlooked this citation in searching out the references). As counter-examples, we have first *çarady aparāhne* (ii.1.2<sup>5</sup>: but O. substitutes *brah-mavādino vadanti*, i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et al.), to show that the sonant spirant, *h*, does not require a like insertion (the case is one of *nāsikya*, xxi. 14); then *rukman upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>1,2</sup>: the case is one for *yama*, xxi.12), to show that a mute receives the increment only after a spirant; and lastly *ishvā ca vajrena ca* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>), to show that a mute only is increased after a spirant. For the second of these counter-examples, O. substitutes two of the same character, namely *yam apnavānah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>) and *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.); for the last, it gives (in a passage which has strayed out of place, and got inserted near the end of the comment to rule 10) *agnaye svāhā* (i.2.2<sup>1</sup> et al.).

In all these combinations, *ç* and *ç* are exempt from duplication by xiv.15, but the sibilants are doubled, except as some authorities (xiv.17,18) would leave them unchanged.

9. *sparçaparād aghoshād ūshmanah paraḥ<sup>1</sup> prathama<sup>2</sup> āgumas<sup>3</sup> tasya sparçasya sasthanah<sup>4</sup> samānasthāno bhinidhāno bhuvati. abhinidhiyatu<sup>5</sup> ity abhinidhānah: āropañīya ity arthah: 'vedāntare tasyā<sup>6</sup> bhāvād atrā ropañīyatvam. yathā<sup>7</sup>: yah----: 'açm-----: grīsh-----: ayasm-----: yuh----- aghoshād iti kim: çarady----- ūshmana iti kim: 'rukman-----' sparçaparād iti kim: ishvā-----.*

*sūtram idam eve 'shtam: na tatparadrāyam<sup>10</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *pratham*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-mo bhavati*. <sup>4</sup> B. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *-dhi-yata*; B. *-niyata*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *vedāntarasyā*; O. *-repa tad a*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> O. *yam apnavānah: sa pratnavat*, and om. all that follows (but see various readings to next rule). <sup>10</sup> G. M. *tu par-*.

13<sup>2</sup>), and *āspātram juhār devānām* (ii.5.9<sup>3</sup>: G. M. have only the first word). All these are examples quite needless to be given, as they are read by Plākshi precisely as prescribed by the preceding rule. Counter-examples,<sup>1</sup> exhibiting his discordant view, are *kūcman chakabhāh* (v.7.23: W. G. M. have *kūcman* only, and B. reads *kūcmandān*, which I have not found in the Sanhitā, although *kūcmandā* occurs in the Tāitt. Āraṇyaka, at ii.7.8) and *akṣhṇayā vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.: given only by W. B., and introduced out of place, between *nish tapāmi* and *doshāvastah*, above).

O. follows an independent course in the interpretation and illustration of this rule. It calls the insertion an *abhinidhāna* (though adding at the end "there is no obligation of *abhinidhāna*") and, for the examples *yah kāmāyeta* to *āspātram*, it substitutes *suçcandra dasma viçpate havvavāt* (iv.4.4<sup>6</sup>: the MS. omits *dasma*), *yaç chandasām* (the thing nearest to this that I have found in the text is *prajāpatiç chandasām*, iii.3.7<sup>1</sup>), *naç cid ati* (this I have overlooked in searching out the references), *syātram* (doubtless meant for *āspātram*), and *bṛhaspatisūrapate* (probably *bṛhaspatisutasya* te, i.4.27).

The present precept was pronounced unapproved in the comment to rule 9.

## उत्तमपरात्तु प्लान्तायणस्य ॥११॥

11. But according to Plākshāyana, on the contrary, when the following mute is a nasal.

This can only mean to teach the precise opposite of the preceding rule; or, that there is no insertion when a surd mute follows the spirant, but only when a nasal follows. And it is first so explained by the commentator, who gives as examples *akṣhṇayā vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.), *açnāti* (i.6.7<sup>8</sup> et al.), and *tīrthe snāti*

11. 'plākshāyanasya tu paksha uttamaparād aghoshād ūshmanah paraḥ<sup>1</sup> prathamāgamo bhavati. yathā<sup>2</sup>: akṣhṇ-----: açnāti: tīrthe----- uttamaparād iti kim: nish-----: 'yah k-----<sup>3</sup> 'yah p-----<sup>4</sup> paçcāt. tuçabdah plākshēḥ paksham prākshipati<sup>5</sup>.

kecid evam ūcuḥ: aghoshatvam ūshmanas tuçabdo nīvartayati 'ti<sup>6</sup>. tatā 'yam sātārthah: uttamaparād tu' ghoshavata<sup>7</sup> ūshmanah paraḥ prathamāgamo bhavati. ahnām-----: çarady-----: brahm----- ghoshavata<sup>8</sup> iti kim: açmā-----: grīsh-----: aya-----.

(1) G. M. om. (2) G. M. om. (3) B. om. (4) G. M. om. (5) W. *apalshiyati*; B. *kshiyati*. (6) G. M. om. iii. (7) in W. only. (8) G. M. *ghoshād*. (9) G. M. *agh-*.

O. substitutes for the whole comment *aghoshaprabhāṃ tuçabde nīvartayati: plākshāyanasya sākhino mate aghoshād ūshmanah uttamaparāpārāt: sātārthapraihamāgamo bhavati: akṣh-----: grī-----: çnāti: aya-----*

*savituh* (i.5.6<sup>4</sup> et al.). As counter-examples, we have *tāh* (i. e. *tās*, ix.2) *sañrohaḥ* (v.3.6<sup>3</sup>: omitted by O.; dropped out in W. B.) and *vāk ta ā pyāyatām* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: only O. has the last two words), in which no aspiration takes place.

A possible difficulty in the application of this rule is noticed and removed by O. alone. Such a case as *arvāk : hi : enam : parāih* (vi.3.3<sup>1</sup>) might seem to fall under its action, the spirant *h* following a surd mute. But it is pointed out that, in virtue of v.38, *h* becomes a fourth mute by special prescription; and hence that rule viii.3 alone applies to the preceding surd, changing it to a sonant.

The place of introduction of this precept and the following—coming in, as they do, right in the midst of the rules respecting duplication, with which they stand in no relation—is quite surprising and objectionable. The commentator, however, passes the matter without notice.

I have not noted any case in which my manuscript of the Sanhitā attempts the aspiration of a mute before a sibilant, as here required. The manuscripts of the commentary, however, which almost never heed the rules for duplication, even in illustrating those rules themselves, often (as we have repeatedly had occasion to notice) observe this one in their citations, although they yet more often neglect it (thus, in the examples here given, G. M. O. aspirate the mutes, and W. B. leave them unchanged). Being taught in company with the duplication, as part of the *varṇa-krama*, it has no claim to be taken account of in the construction of an ordinary Tāittirīya text. Respecting the teachings of the other Prāṭicākhyas upon the subject, see the note to Āth. Pr. ii.6.

## बाडभीकारस्यासस्थानपरः ॥ १३ ॥

13. According to Bādabhīkāra, when the following spirant is not of the same position with it.

Rule ii.44 teaches the accordance of the several (surd) spirants, in their order, with the series of mutes, in point of position—more literally, of place of production.

T. calls the individual here referred to Bādavīkāra, and W. O. have in the rule *vādabhīkāra*, but in the comment *bādabh-*; the rest have uniformly *b* as initial letter, which I have therefore adopted, as being decidedly better supported than *v*. Weber gives the two forms *vādabh-* (V. Pr. p. 250) and *vāṭabh-* (ib., p. 78).

13. *bādabhīkārasya* <sup>1</sup> *matu ātmano* <sup>2</sup> *'sasthānoshmaparāḥ prathamāḥ savargīyam* <sup>3</sup> *dvitīyam āpadyate. 'samānam sthānam yasyā* <sup>4</sup> *'sāu sasthānaḥ: na sasthāno 'sasthānaḥ: sa paro yasmāt sa tathā 'ktaḥ. yathā* <sup>5</sup> *: viś-....: tat-....* <sup>6</sup> *asasthāna iti kim: tat-....* <sup>6</sup>

*ne 'dam sūtram iṣṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *gāhīno*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. (and begin the next word as-). <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. om. <sup>6</sup> O. ins. *idāra(?)sthāno yam sakārah*.

precedes *ksh*, since elsewhere it can stand only in *pausa*. *Jihvāmūliya* occurs (by the conversion of final *h* according to ix.2) in the groups *ṛk*, *ṛkl*, *ṛkr*, *ṛksh*, *ṛkshn*, *ṛkshv*, and *ṛkh*; *upadhmanīya*, in like manner, in *ṃp*, *ṃpy*, *ṃpr*, *ṃpl*, and *ṃph*: the combinations of *r* have been enumerated above (under rule 4).

The other Prātiçākhyas have rules equivalent with this, into the variety of expression of which we do not need to enter.

It is to be accounted as a reprehensible omission on the part of our treatise, that it gives no direction as to the treatment of a group beginning with *anusvāra*. The Vāj. Prāt. (iv.107) expressly exempts *anusvāra* from duplication; and, in the Rik Prāt., in the fundamental rule (vi.1), *anusvāra* is ruled out of account in the estimation of consonant groups, it being taught that a consonant is doubled after it in the same manner as after a vowel. There is no good reason to doubt that the same is to be understood as the doctrine of the present work, and that it would have *anusvāra*, so far as duplication is concerned, deemed and taken as merely an affection of the vowel to which it is attached. That this is not explicitly stated, stands in connection with the equivocal position of the Tāitt. Prāt. in reference to the nature of *anusvāra* (see p. 68): according to the view taken at the beginning of the next chapter (xv.1), rules respecting it are no more required than in the Āth. Prāt., where they are equally wanting.

The commentator notices that some would read the rule now under discussion as two, cutting off *avasāne* from the rest; and for the reason that otherwise, as the rule stands, it seems natural to understand that “*r*, *h*, *z*, and *ṃ*, when standing before a pause,” are not doubled; as a similar construction was made in rule 10 of the fifth chapter. But he denies the validity of the objection, since duplication of *r* and the rest before a pause is not in the remotest

<sup>1</sup> *avasāna iti*: <sup>2</sup> *caturṇān varṇānām* <sup>3</sup> *prthag eva sūtraṁ* <sup>4</sup> *kecid*  
*ācuḥ*: <sup>5</sup> *ekikaraṇe* <sup>6</sup> *doshadarçanāt*: *asānu* <sup>7</sup> *doshah*: *avasāne var-*  
*taṁānā rephaviçarjanīyādāya* <sup>8</sup> *ity anvayasampādanam* <sup>9</sup>: *ava-*  
*graha āçīr dhūḥ suvar* (v.10) *itivad iti ceti* <sup>10</sup>: *nāi 'sha do-*  
*shah*: *raviçarjanīyādīnām* <sup>11</sup> *padāvasāne* <sup>12</sup> *dvitvaprapṛtīr* <sup>13</sup> *dūrot-*  
*sārite* <sup>14</sup> *'ti ne 'yam atra çankā 'sti* <sup>15</sup>: *avasāneprthakkarāṇe* <sup>16</sup> *saty* <sup>17</sup>  
*avasāne* <sup>18</sup> *kinī vā bhavati* <sup>19</sup> *'ti sākāñkshatayā* <sup>20</sup> *vacanam anarthu-*  
*kaṁ* <sup>21</sup> *syāt*: *ekikaraṇe tu raviçarjanīyetivarṇasāhacaryād* <sup>22</sup> *ava-*  
*sāne vartamāno varṇa iti* <sup>23</sup> *labhyate*: *tasmād ekikaraṇam eva*  
*raṁanīyam*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *yād*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. combine, as in rule. <sup>3</sup> O. om. ca. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-āyeran*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *-āna iti v*. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *kecid idān sūtraṁ prthag evo 'cuḥ*: *avasāna iti ca*: *raviçarjanīyājihvāmūliyopadhmanīyā iti ca*: *koṭham prthakkarāṇam*. <sup>8</sup> W. *caturvarṇāḥ*; B. om. *varṇānām*. <sup>9</sup> W. corrupt. <sup>10</sup> G. M. O. *ko 'sānu*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. O. *ravi*; B. *-nīyā*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *avayavaçamābhāvanam*; O. *asya dvitvaṁ sañp*. <sup>13</sup> O. om. <sup>14</sup> O. *avasānevyaçīrīkṣasthale vis*. <sup>15</sup> B. om. <sup>16</sup> W. *rephaprapṛtīh*. <sup>17</sup> W. *tatsā*; O. *dūrotot*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *kinī cit*; O. *kinī ca*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. O. *prth*. <sup>20</sup> W. *sti*; G. M. *nāsti*. <sup>21</sup> G. M. *-kshā tathā*; O. *-kshayā*. <sup>22</sup> B. *arth*. <sup>23</sup> W. *savis*; B. *vis*; O. om. *varṇa*. <sup>24</sup> O. om.



## प्रथमपरश्च प्लान्तिप्लान्तायणयोः ॥ १७ ॥

17. Or, according to Plākshi and Plākshāyana, when followed by a first mute.

That is to say, these two *śākhināu* would leave a spirant free from duplication before an unaspirated surd mute, contrary to the first rule of the chapter. The groups which would be thus affected are *ṣc* and *ṣcy*, *ṣp*, *shk* and *shky* and *shkr*, *shṭ* and its further combinations (*shṭy*, *shṭr*, *shṭv*), *shp*, *sk*, *st* and its further combinations (*stm*, *sty*, *str* and *stry*, *stv*), and *sp*. One hardly sees why combinations with a second mute (namely *ṣch* and *ṣchy*, *shkh*, *shth* and *shṭhy*, *sth* and *sthv*, *sph* and *sphy*) should not be subject to the same rule—but then, one must not expect to see the reason of anything whatever, general rule or particular exception, in this doctrine of duplications. It may be made a question whether the single case, *rsht*, falling under rule 4 is not also here aimed at; if the pair of kinsmen did not overlook it, it is doubtless included with the rest.

The examples (which are lost in W.) are *suṣcandra dasma* (iv. 4.4<sup>6</sup>: O. omits *dasma*) and *ashtāu kṛtvāḥ* (vi.4.5<sup>1</sup>); a counter-example, with a last mute after the spirant, is *tasmād evān viduśhā* (vi.4.9<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *viduśhā*); but O. has, with B., omitted to point out that this is a counter-example, and gives further, as such, *ishvā ca vajreṇa* (v.7.3<sup>1</sup>).

The commentator then goes on to say that although the word *ca*, 'or,' in the rule brings down by implication a spirant pure and simple (without exclusion of any sound belonging to that class), yet the real application is only to *ṣ*, *sh*, *s*, and *h*, since otherwise the mention of *ṣ* and *ṣ* in rule 15 would be without meaning, their exception being assured by the present precept. The interpretation is doubtless true, but the reason given for it is only acceptable on the supposition that what is here put forward as the view of two individual authorities is in fact the accepted doctrine of the Prāṭicākhya; in any other case, there is no inconsistency or interference between rules 15 and 17, and the commentator should rather have said that, as the pair of dissidents doubtless accepted

17. *plākshiplākshāyanayoḥ pakṣhe*<sup>1</sup> *prathamapara ūshmā divtvaṁ nā* *padayate. cakāra ūshmānam anuvādicati. suṣc-----*  
*ashtāu-----* *prathamapara iti kim.*<sup>3</sup> *tasmād-----*<sup>2</sup> *prathamāḥ paro yasmād asāu prathamaparah.*<sup>4</sup>

*cakāro* *tra*<sup>5</sup> *yady apy*<sup>6</sup> *ūshmamātrākārshakas*<sup>7</sup> *tathā* *pi*<sup>8</sup> *śaśasaheshv eva sampratyayah. anyathā*<sup>9</sup> *vasāne ravisarjanīya* (xiv.15) *iti*<sup>10</sup> *sātre jihvāmālīyopudhmānīyayor grahaṇaṁ vyartham. anenā*<sup>11</sup> *va nishedhasiddhe*<sup>12</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. mate. <sup>2</sup> W. om. <sup>3</sup> B. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *prathamapara iti kim: ishvā-----*  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>6</sup> W. om. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *ūshmā-*. <sup>8</sup> W. O. *hē*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. O. om. <sup>11</sup> O. ins. *shāi*. <sup>12</sup> W. O. *-shedhe s-*.

Rules 18–22 are pronounced unapproved under rule 22.

रेफपरश्च हकारः ॥ १९ ॥

19. Nor *h*, when followed by *r*.

The word *ca* in the rule is declared to continue the implication of "according to Hārīta." This individual having in the former rule limited his denial of duplication to a surd spirant, and so left the sonant spirant *h* (? the MSS. say "a surd spirant") liable to be always doubled, it is now taught that *h* with the distinctive mark of a following *r* remains single. The example given, alike in all MSS., is *duduhre ahrayah* (i.5.5<sup>1</sup>); counter-examples are *juhve* (i. e. *juhve*) *hy agnis tvā* "hvayati (i.1.12: G. M. end with *agnih*; W. B. omit altogether, along with the introductory explanation to the next citation), to show that *h* would be doubled by Hārīta before any other letter than *r*; and *gukraṁ* (i. e. *gukraṁ*) *te anyat* (iv.1.11<sup>2</sup>: O. omits), to show that any other letter than *h* would be doubled before *r*.

O., though using two of the citations given by the other MSS., has a wholly independent exposition of this rule.

टवर्गश्च तवर्गपरः ॥ २० ॥

20. Nor a lingual mute, when followed by a dental.

That is to say, in the opinion of Hārīta. Thus, in *vashaṭ te vishṇo* (ii.2.12<sup>4</sup>: O. has *vishaṭ te vikshaṇe*, but it is doubtless only a corrupt reading) and *vid draviṇam* (i.8.13<sup>1</sup> et al.), Hārīta would leave the groups *tt* and *ddr* untouched, while the rules of the treatise would require *ttt* and *ddd*. The other groups in which he would teach the simpler combination are *ttr*, *dd*, *ddhr*, and *rtt*; and *ts*, *tsv* and *rts* would fall indirectly under the same exception, since, by v.33, *t* (converted to *th* by xiv.12) must be inserted between *t* and *s*: *ts*, then, would in Hārīta's hands become *tths*; in those of the regular adherents of this school, *ttths*. Counter-examples, of obvious application, are *vāk te* (i. e. *vākk te*; i.3.9<sup>1</sup>: wanting in B. O.), *tat te* (i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.: found in W. only, and of no

19. 'pūrvam ūshmā 'ghoṣha ity ukte' 'ghoṣhoshmano nityam dvitve prāpte 'viśiṣṭa idānīm' rephaparo hākāraḥ<sup>3</sup> cakārākṛṣṭa-hārītamate dvitvam nā 'padyate. yathā: dud----- rephapara iti kim: 'juhve----- hākāra iti kim: 'gukraṁ----- rephah paro yasmād asāu rephaparah.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. a. (<sup>2</sup>) W. *viśeṣṭādinām*; B. *viśiṣṭādivadanam*; G. M. *viśinashṭi id-*  
<sup>3</sup> W. -re. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>5</sup>) W. B. om.

O. substitutes *caṣabdo hārītasya 'nvādeṣakah*: *hārītasya śākhīno male rephaparo hākāro dvitvam apadyate. dud----- rephapara iti kim: juhve-----*

20. *cakāro*<sup>1</sup> *hārītānvādeṣakah*<sup>2</sup>: <sup>3</sup> *tavargas tavargaparo na dvitvam apadyate. yathā: 'vashaṭ-----' vid----- 'tavargah paro*

duplication has been once performed, it is not done over again, as otherwise the process would go on *ad infinitum*. And if it be objected that rule 23 sufficiently forbids this repeated duplication, and that this one would therefore be an unnecessary repetition, the answer is made that that is no fault, since the matter in hand is a division of opinions—that is to say, doubtless, that here Hārta's view only is concerned, and so there is no necessary connection between the two rules.

Fortunately, the commentator is able to add that the present precept, along with its four predecessors, is to be ruled out of account as unapproved, so that what it means is of very little consequence.

### सवर्णसवर्गियर् ॥ २३ ॥

23. A letter followed by one homogeneous with itself, or one of the same mute-series, is not duplicated.

By *savarna*, 'of like color or sound,' we are told, is signified identity of form, not merely correspondence as regards place and organ of production. The difference is, that the latter description would apply to the spirants, in their relation to the series of mutes (ii.44,45), and it is not the usage of this school to exempt the spirants (except *χ* and *φ*, rule 15) from duplication, even before a mute with which they are akin. The Ath. Pr. (iii.30) does so exempt them. The epithet *savarna*, then, applies only to an identical letter and to the nasal semivowels into which (by v.26,28) *n* and *m* are converted before *y*, *l*, and *v*.

The cited examples of the application of the rule to homogeneous sounds are *atvakkāya* (vii.5.12<sup>2</sup>), *attā havīṁshi* (ii.6.12<sup>2</sup>), *pippakā te śaravyāyādi* (v.5.19: only O. has the last word), *saṁyattāḥ*.

22. *cakāro hārītākaraśhakāḥ*<sup>1</sup>: *para ity ekavacanena*<sup>2</sup> *vakāro*<sup>3</sup> *gr̥hyate*: *pūrvasūtrasthanimittayoḥ*<sup>4</sup> *so*<sup>5</sup> *pi*<sup>6</sup> *na dvitvam āpadyate*. *yathā*: *vi*-----: *ā*----- *vakāra iti kim*: *kalpān*----- *sparśa*<sup>8</sup> *evāi* *'keshām ācāryāṇām* (xiv.3) *ity 'atrā* *'radhāraṇanirākarandya*<sup>9</sup> *'yam* *ārambhah*. *athavā*<sup>10</sup>: *taddvite*<sup>11</sup> *kr̥te pu-ro dvitīyapuryāyo*<sup>12</sup> *'dvitvavidhir nā* *'sti*<sup>13</sup>: *anavasthāprasaṅgāt*. *nanu savarnasavargīyapara* (xiv.23) *iti parasūtrenā*<sup>14</sup> *'pi punardvitvanishedhaḥ*: <sup>15</sup> *'pāunaruktyam mā bhūd iti*<sup>16</sup>: *mata-bhedān nāi* *'sha*<sup>17</sup> *doṣa iti brūmah*.

*hārītamatā*<sup>18</sup> *ūśhmā* *'ghoṣa* (xiv.18) *ityādīsūtrapañca-kam*<sup>19</sup> *anisṭam*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*tamatāk*-. <sup>2</sup> W. *eva* v-. <sup>3</sup> W. *sav*-, and puts after *gr̥hyate*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *paraḥ*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *hārītamate*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*capara*-. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *evandhā*...-*ṇāyāyā* *'yam*-. <sup>8</sup> W. B. *yathā*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. om. *tad*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. -*āyena*-. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*dhin na prāp-* *noti*-. <sup>12</sup> W. -om. *para*-. <sup>13</sup> G. M. ins. *tasmāt*. <sup>14</sup> W. -*kyo mā bhavati*; G. M. -*kyam āvati*-. <sup>15</sup> W. *va*-. <sup>16</sup> G. M. -*mate*-. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *ityādi paraḥ ce tyantam sū-*. O. wanting (see above).

restrictions to the sphere of duplication, as there are somewhat over a hundred consonant groups to which it applies.

## नानुत्तम उत्तमपरः ॥ २४ ॥

24. Unless, indeed, it be a non-nasal followed by a nasal.

This is a precept of counter-exception, contravening in part the exceptions established by the foregoing rule. Examples are *yācñā* (i.5.7<sup>4</sup>: the only example of this combination which the text affords), *yajñe-yajñe* (iii.1.11<sup>2</sup>: but O. has *yajñena*, vi.5.3<sup>1</sup> et al.), *ātñārah* (v.6.5<sup>3</sup>: also the sole instance), *sa pratnavat* (ii.2.12<sup>1</sup> et al.: in O. only), and *pāpmānam* (i.4.41 et al.): a counter-example is *tam mā devāh* (iii.3.2<sup>2</sup>: wanting in O.).

The cases here denied exemption from duplication are those in which, according to xxi.12, *yama* is introduced between the two mutes. According to the Vāj. Prāt. (iv.111), *yama* suspends duplication.

## अथैकेषामाचार्याणाम् ॥ २५ ॥

25. Now for the views of certain teachers.

A simple heading for the rules that follow, in force as far as rule 28 inclusive—or, according to the commentator's interpretation of rule 28, through 27 only.

## लकारो रुशवकारपरः ॥ २६ ॥

26. A *l* is not doubled when followed by *h*, *ç*, or *v*.

The commentator's examples are *malhā ā 'labhanta* (ii.1.2<sup>4</sup>: but B. O. have *-bheta*, which is found in the same division, and G. M. read *-bhate*, which is doubtless a corruption of the same), *çatavalgo vi roha* (i.3.5 and vi.3.3<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *vi roha*), and *tato bīlvaḥ* (ii.1.8<sup>2</sup>: O. substitutes *bāilvo yūpaḥ*, ii.1.8<sup>1</sup>); his counter-examples (omitted in O.) are *kalmāshī* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>) and *kalyāñī* (vii.1.6<sup>6</sup>).

This rule, we are told, determines the usage of the school so far as the combinations *lh* and *lç* are concerned, but not in the case of

24. *nakāro 'yam pratiprasavārthaḥ*<sup>1</sup>: <sup>2</sup>*uttamaparo 'nuttamo dvitvam āpadyate. yathā*<sup>3</sup>: *yācñā*: *yaj*-----: *ātñārah*: *'sa*-----<sup>4</sup> *pāpmānam*. <sup>5</sup>*anuttama uttamapara iti kim: tam*-----<sup>6</sup> *uttamaḥ paro yasmād asāv*<sup>2</sup> *uttamaparah. savarnasavargīyapara*<sup>6</sup> (xiv.23) *iti pratishedhaprāptāu ayam drambhaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> O. *prāvārtha*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>(4)</sup> in O. only. <sup>(5)</sup> O. om.; B. om. *anuttama*; W. om. *uttama*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. *para*.

25. *athe 'ty ayam adbhikārah: ekeshām*<sup>1</sup> *mate*<sup>2</sup> *kriyata*<sup>3</sup> *ity etad adbhikṛtam veditavyam ita uttaram yad vakshyamaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ācāryāṇām*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *matam*; O. *maçcitam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *adbhikri*.

this as the accepted doctrine of the school, and as determining the reading in this *śākhā*. How this strange result is arrived at, we have to follow through his lengthy exposition closely enough to discover.

In the first place, *vyañjanapara*, 'followed by a consonant,' is declared to mean 'followed by any other consonant than a mute,' because otherwise, as we have read 'followed by a mute' in the preceding rule, the treatise would be guilty of a needless repetition so far as sequence by a mute is concerned. To this the natural answer would be that the two rules do not come into collision, since they do not occupy the same ground: the former relates to any mute in any situation, the latter only to an unaltered mute at the end of a word; and if the one is declared to have a single pronunciation before a mute only, the other before any consonant whatever, what objection can possibly be taken? Moreover, we are stating here the views of certain authorities, of whom one set might hold rule 27, and the other rule 28: and even if they partly covered one another, there would be nothing wrong about it. Once more, *sparṣapara* is claimed to be implied here merely for the purpose of denying it, the commentator's conclusion being that there is duplication of *n* before a mute, though not before a semi-vowel; and that is certainly a very remarkable kind of *anuvṛtti* which should work thus by contraries. Of the last two considerations, the commentator takes no notice (although he has once appealed to the former of them in a somewhat similar case above, under rule 22): the first he states and replies to. It may be objected, he says, that there is a difference of affecting cause laid down in consequence of the difference of the affected letter; the latter is here qualified as final and as original; and the former as being any consonant whatever. Nevertheless, he claims, there would be meaninglessness of the qualification of the affecting cause,

28. *vyañjanapara iti sparṣavyatiriktvavyañjanapara ity arthah: anyathā sparṣānām api grahane pūrvasūtre 'pi sparṣa' ity ukta-  
tvāt pāunaruktyam syāt. nanu nimittaviśeṣhān<sup>2</sup> nimittaviśeṣho<sup>3</sup>  
'sti: padāntatvam prakṛtatvam ca nimittino<sup>4</sup> viśeṣhā<sup>5</sup> nimittasya  
tu sarvavyañjanātmakatvam<sup>6</sup>: iti cet: tathā 'pi sparṣabhāge' ni-  
mittaviśeṣhasya<sup>7</sup> vāiyarthīyam<sup>8</sup>: sparṣapara ity<sup>9</sup> atra sāmānyenā  
'pi<sup>10</sup> nimittaviśeṣhasya<sup>11</sup> vigatavāt<sup>12</sup>: tasmād<sup>13</sup> antasthādaya evā  
'tra vyañjanāgabdeno 'cyante. 'cakāro yady api sparṣamātrā-  
karṣhakas tathā 'pi pāriṣeṣhyān<sup>14</sup> 'nakārasya<sup>15</sup> 'nukarṣhaṇam.<sup>16</sup>  
tathā hi: antasthādivyañjanaparatve 'nyasparṣānām<sup>17</sup> avikṛtā-  
nām padānte sthitir nā 'sti: samrād ity atrā 'stī 'ti cet: mām  
'vam: na sañ sām iti<sup>18</sup> rāpara (xiii.4) ity atra vāiyarthīyāt<sup>19</sup>:  
itiṣabdo makārasya dvitvasadbhāvam bodhayati<sup>20</sup> 'ty<sup>21</sup> adhyayanā-  
nurodhād upapāditam: tasmān nāi 'sha nishedhaviśayah. 'nā  
'pi brahmaṇvantaḥ: nyañ---- ityādiviśayah.<sup>22</sup> kutah: iha*

The authority of Mâhisheya (see note to the introductory verses, p. 7) is further appealed to as making the same restriction of implication. His explanation is that, in the view of some teachers, a final unaltered *n* followed by a semivowel or spirant is not doubled. Examples are *mitro janān yātuyati* (iii.4.11<sup>5</sup>: only G. M. have *mitro*), *omanvatī te* (ii.6.9<sup>5</sup>; p. *oman-vatī*), and *etān homān* (i.5.4<sup>4</sup>); in all which we are to understand that the *n* remains single. On the other hand, there is duplication in *anyā* (i. e. *annyā*) *yanti* (ii.5.12<sup>2</sup>) and *anv* (i. e. *annv*) *aha māsāh* (i.7.13<sup>1</sup>), where the *n* is not final; in *tān* (i. e. *tānn*) *kalpayati* (v.3.1<sup>2</sup>) and *imān* (i. e. *imānn*) *bhadrān* (i.6.3<sup>1</sup>), where the *n* is followed by a mute; and also in *tān rakshadhvam* (i.2.7) and *vāishnavān rakshohanah* (i.3.2<sup>2</sup>), where, it is asserted, the *n* does not maintain its original form. Since, however, there is no rule in the Prāticākhya for altering a *n* in this last pair of cases, the commentator quotes (from the same authority, we may conjecture, which has been recently twice appealed to, under rules 23 and 26) a prescription to the effect that *n* when preceding a *r* or an *r*-vowel, or when following a lingual (the MSS. say, a dental) mute, is uttered in the lingual position: thus, he says, in virtue of its change of position, the *n* is phonetically altered. Finally, he makes an alleged citation from the Çikshā (not found in the version known to us), which teaches that a final *n* preceding *r* exhibits a peculiarity, and is liable to duplication. Such a modification of the utterance of *n* forms no part of the phonetic system of any of the Prāticākhyas.

Thus is brought to an end the tedious subject of duplication, the physical foundation of which is of the obscurest, although the pains with which the Hindu *çākhināh* have elaborated it, and the earnestness with which they assert their discordant views respecting it, prove that it had for them a real, or what seemed like a real, value.

*çikshā cāi 'vaṁ vakshyati :*

<sup>43</sup>*rephāt pārvo*<sup>43</sup> *nakāro yaḥ padānte*<sup>44</sup> *yatra*<sup>45</sup> *drçyate :*

*viçeṣaṁ tatra jānīyād dvitvaṁ iti*<sup>46</sup> *abhidhīyate.*

<sup>47</sup> *vyañjanam asmāt* <sup>48</sup>*param iti*<sup>48</sup> *vyañjanaparaḥ : prakṛtiḥ*<sup>49</sup> *svabhāvaḥ : tatsambandhi prakṛtaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> O. -*çapara*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*tiavaçān*; O. -*tiānīmīlav*-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. -*viçiṣṭo* 'py *arho*; O. *nāmīttikaviçeṣo* 'py a. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*ttō*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. -*shah*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. -*kam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*çaviḍh*-. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -*çiṣṭe* 'sya. <sup>9</sup> O. -*rīṭhye*. <sup>10</sup> O. *avyāñjimasāmānye*; G. M. om. *api*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -*syā*; O. -*sha*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. 'pi g-; O. *pag*-. <sup>13</sup> O. om. <sup>14</sup> W. B. *cakāra sparçāksharapārī*; G. M. *cakārasthānispārçāksharshakāḥ pariçeṣhyān*. <sup>15</sup> B. *takāra-karṣhaṇam*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. O. *saty any*-. <sup>17</sup> G. M. ins. *tu*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. om. <sup>19</sup> W. om. *iti*. <sup>20</sup> W. om. <sup>21</sup> W. -*āve*. <sup>22</sup> G. M. om. <sup>23</sup> B. *svarasya*. <sup>24</sup> W. B. *nak*-. <sup>25</sup> W. *dak*;- B. om. <sup>26</sup> O. -*divyañjanap*-. <sup>27</sup> W. -*sākal*-. <sup>28</sup> O. -*ddhēv*-. <sup>29</sup> O. om.; B. G. M. *tatrāt 'vaṁ s*;- G. M. -*tre* 'yo-. <sup>30</sup> O. ins. *acāryānām*. <sup>31</sup> W. -*sthāv*y-. <sup>32</sup> O. om. <sup>33</sup> W. a. <sup>34</sup> W. O. *av*;- B. *v*;- G. M. *rav*-. <sup>35</sup> all the MSS. *tav*-. <sup>36</sup> G. M. *na*. <sup>37</sup> W. B. O. *tav*-. <sup>38</sup> W. O. *ata sth*;- G. M. *asthāne*. <sup>39</sup> G. M. om. <sup>40</sup> O. -*da*; G. M. -*dāt*-. <sup>41</sup> G. M. om. <sup>42</sup> O. ins. *asti*. <sup>43</sup> all but O. *rephap*-. <sup>44</sup> W. G. -*to*. <sup>45</sup> G. M. *yadī*. <sup>46</sup> B. om. <sup>47</sup> O. ins. *cakāro kanasyarçāksharshakāḥ*. <sup>48</sup> W. *paro*. <sup>49</sup> G. M. O. -*tir iti*.

For an exposition of the place and value of the enclitic circumflex in the Hindu accentual system, see the note to Ath. Pr. iii.65. It may doubtless admit of question whether the Hindu phonetists, in noting the syllable naturally grave as being otherwise than grave when immediately preceded by an acute, would not have apprehended it better, and described it more truly, as a middle tone between acute and grave, rather than a combination (i.40) of acute and grave. Arguments drawn from the analogies of the Greek and Latin accentual systems (see F. Misteli, in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, vol. xvii., 1868; also Prof. J. Hadley, in the *Proceedings of the Am. Oriental Society* for Oct. 1869 [*Journal*, vol. ix., pp. lxii.-lxiii.]) may press upon us this latter view as the more plausible. But that any one having access to the sources of knowledge upon the subject should dispute the substantial identity in physical character of the Greek circumflex and the Sanskrit independent *svarita*, and should set down the latter as a "middle tone," in the face of all authority and of all sound phonetic theory, savors of inexcusable carelessness or prejudice.

### व्यञ्जनान्तरहितो ऽपि ॥ ३० ॥

30. Even when consonants intervene.

For the necessity of this explicit statement, see the note on the preceding rule. The commentator, having already given under the latter several cases in which the affected and the affecting vowel were separated by one or more consonants, has nothing that is new to offer; but he quotes, nevertheless, *tād agne anṛnó bhavāmi* (iii 3.8<sup>2</sup>: B. O. omit *bhavāmi*) and *yás tvā hrđá* (i.4.46<sup>1</sup>): in the first case, *ag-* and *bha-* are circumflexed; in the second, *tvā*.

### नोदात्तस्वरितपरः ॥ ३१ ॥

31. Not, however, when an acute or circumflex follows.

That is to say, the syllable naturally unaccented or grave—but which, coming next after an acute, would usually take, by rule 29 the tone of transition from higher to lower pitch—retains its low or grave tone if immediately followed by an acute, or by a (*nitya* or independent, of course) circumflex, of which the first element is acute: the pitch of voice is governed by the following tone in preference to the preceding, and sinks at once, without perceptible movement of transfer, to the level of *unudātta*, as a vantage ground from which to rise to the immediately succeeding high point.

In this rule, as well as that to which it constitutes an exception

30. *vyañjanāntarhito* 'py *udātāt paro 'nudāttaḥ svaritam āpadyate. yathā*<sup>2</sup>: *tad*-----: *yas*----- 'ity *ādī*. *antarhito* *vyavahita ity arthaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> O. *ant*-. <sup>2</sup> B. *-tatvam*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

According to the majority of MSS. of the comment, the denial of these skeptical people is not limited to the enclitic *svārīta*, but extends to the whole accent, in all its seven forms (xx.1-8). Thus, namely; in the *brāhmaṇa* of the Vājasaneyins (that is to say, the *Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa*) there are only two accents, the acute and the grave. But O. has once more a version of its own, stating that the authorities here referred to would not, like Āgniveçyāyana, annul rule 31 simply, but would also deny the rules in general for the enclitic circumflex, as in *sá idhānāḥ* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>) and *prapā'* (? MS. *prathā*) *asi* (ii.5.12<sup>4</sup>). We cannot well hesitate to prefer the latter interpretation; there has been no question here of the independent circumflex, and a denial of its existence would be altogether out of place and impertinent. Nor is the reference to the *Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* one at all likely to have been intended by the *Prātiçākhyā*. And it is not true, except so far as the mode of designating the accents is concerned, that that treatise has no circumflex accent: it writes, to be sure, only the *anudatta* sign, so that, if the value of this were the same as in the other usual systems of designation, all its syllables would be either grave or acute: and on this foundation, later Hindu systematists have declared them such, and painfully elaborated an exposition of them (see Weber's *Ind. Studien*, x. 397 ff.).

Rules 32 and 33 are, naturally enough, declared unapproved; but to us it is both interesting and important to find that there were Hindu phonetists in the ancient time who did not admit such an element of utterance as the enclitic circumflex.

## CHAPTER XV.

CONTENTS: 1-3, nasalization of vowels, or insertion of *anuvāra*, in cases of the loss or alteration of *n* or *m*; 4-5, the same, in the cases detailed in the next chapter; 6-8, the same, in the case of certain finals; 9, utterance in monotone.

33. *na kevalam udāttāt paraḥ: kiṃ tu sarva eva saptavidha-svarīto nā'stī 'ty eke çākhino manyante. tathā hi: vājasaneyi-brāhmaṇe<sup>1</sup> dvāv eva svarāu: udāttaç cā 'nudāttaç ca. ne 'dam sūtraadvayam<sup>2</sup> iṣṭam.*

O. substitutes *eke çākhino manyante na kevalānudāttāḥ udāttaçariṭaparāḥ: prati-śhidhyati kiṃ tarhi udāttaçapūrvakaç ca: sa-----: prāthā----- ne 'dam* etc.

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiçākhyavivarāṇe  
caturdaço<sup>3</sup> 'dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *vājanepūbrā-*; B. *nehībr-*; G. M. *neyabr-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *-tram*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. O. *dvitiye praçne dvitiyo*.



This is a mere introduction to the next rule, which informs us what the doctrine is which these dissidents hold instead. The commentator pronounces it the approved doctrine for this *śākhā*.

ततस्वनुस्वारः ॥ ३ ॥

3. And claim that, on the contrary, *anusvāra* is inserted after the vowel.

The *anusvāra* here prescribed is called by the commentator an *āgama*, 'increment.' Its insertion is the alternative view to the nasalization of the vowel, and, as is pointed out, is held where that nasalization is denied—of which denial, the *tu*, 'on the contrary,' is the sign in the rule. There is one example given: *sa trīṇr ekādaśāṇ iha* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>: W. B. omit *sa*).

The approval of this rule is, of course, involved in that of its predecessor; and the usage of the recorded Tāittirīya text corresponds.

स्नादिषु चैकपद उष्मपरः ॥ ४ ॥

4. *Anusvāra* is also inserted in the case of *sra* etc., in a single word, before a spirant.

"Also" (*ca*) in the rule, we are told, brings down the implication of the above specified increment. The *srādayas*, '*sra* etc.,' are the whole detail, given in the next chapter, of the occurrence of *anusvāra* in the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā otherwise than as the result of the rules of combination, implied in rules 1-3 of this chapter. The precept, then, is introductory to the detail referred to, and also lays down some general limitations affecting it. The commentator quotes a single case, *ṣoṇsā moda iṣe 'ti* (iii.2.9<sup>5</sup>: it falls under xvi.2); and then gives counter-examples, establishing the restrictions made: *tāsāṁ trīṇi ca* (ii.5.8<sup>3</sup>) shows that the insertion is made only under the circumstances defined in chapter xvi.; *tam mā sañ srja varcasā* (i.4.45<sup>3</sup> et al.: only G. M. have *varcasā*) and *prastaram ā hi sīdu* (ii.6.12<sup>6</sup>: found in O. only) show that it is to

2. *ekeshām mate pūrvasūtrokteshu* <sup>1</sup> *sānunāsikyam* <sup>2</sup> *na* <sup>3</sup> *bhavati.*  
*uktāny evo 'dāharanāni.*

*idam 'eve 'shṭam* <sup>4</sup> *na tu pūrvam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *sīdhāneshu.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *nā 'nu.* <sup>3</sup> W. G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. *eva sūtram ish.*

3. *tata iti sarvanāmnā parāmṛshāt* <sup>1</sup> *svarāt* <sup>2</sup> *paro 'nusvāra* <sup>3</sup> *āgamo bhavati. yathā:* *sa*----- *parāmṛshāsvaryā* <sup>4</sup> *'nunāsikam* <sup>5</sup> *guṇam tuṣabdo nivartayati* <sup>6</sup> *'ti:* *tasmād anunāsikapratishedhapakṣha* <sup>7</sup> *evā 'yam anus āragamaḥ syāt.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *-shṭa.* <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-ra.* <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. *-svār.* <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *-shṭāt svarā.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. *-ka.* <sup>7</sup> O. *-vāray.* <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. *iti.* <sup>9</sup> W. B. *-dhāt p-;* G. M. *-dhah vak-hyamāṇa.*

eight vowels (namely *a, ā, i, ī, u, ū, r, ṛ*) are by [some?] teachers declared nasal when they are not *praghyā*, and stand as finals before a pause. This is different, first, in including *r* and *ṛ* (which are not *samānāksharāṇi* according to our treatise: compare i.2; but the difference amounts to nothing, as the vowels in question never occur *avasāne*, but only *avagrahe*); and secondly, in limiting the nasalization to finals, before a pause. But it is perfectly evident that our rule also applies to finals only, and, as we shall see, the commentator resorts to great violence to bring in the implication of "final" in rule 8, below. Again, the specification "in *saṁhitā* also," in rule 8, and the interpretation of *padam* in rule 7 as signifying *padakāle*, 'in *pada*-text,' sufficiently prove that the present precept does not apply in *saṁhitā*—that is, that *avasāne*, 'in pause,' is implied here. And the absence of statement or *anuvṛtti* of these two essential implications is strong additional evidence that the rules are interpolated.

By most of the MSS., only one example is given, namely *kulāyini vasumatī* (iv.3.4<sup>1</sup>), which, if our understanding, as above explained, is correct, is to be read, in *pada*-text, *kulāyiniṁ : vasumatīm*. O. adds *aminanta evāḥ* (iii.1.11<sup>5</sup>), one of the cases of suspended combination falling under x.13, and (by R. Pr. ii.31,32) in the Rig-Veda requiring nasalization of the uncombined final: its citation seems to indicate that O. would not limit the operation of the rule to the *pada*-text. To show that the nasalization does not take place in uncombinable vowels, or *pragrahas*, are quoted, in *pada*-form, *amī iti* (iii.3.7<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tanā iti* (ii.2.7<sup>5</sup>: omitted in O.). To illustrate the limitation to simple vowels, we find in most MSS. *so evāi 'shāi 'tasya* (ii.2.9<sup>7</sup>); but O. gives instead *agnaye 'nikavate* (i.8.4<sup>1</sup> et al.), *'vishṇav e 'hi 'dam* (ii.4.12<sup>3</sup>), and *vāyav ishtaye* (ii.2.12<sup>8</sup>).

The commentator, as he has done repeatedly before (under i.49, ii.7, v.2), notices the apposition in the rule of *apragrahāḥ* and *samānāksharāṇi*, two words of different gender. He signifies, further, under the next rule, that both that and this are unapproved.

पदं च प्रुतः शाङ्खायनकाण्डमायनयोः ॥ ७ ॥

7. As is also, according to Çāṅkhāyana and Kāṇḍamāyana, a protracted *pada*.

By *pada* is here signified, according to the commentator, a word

6. <sup>1</sup> *yāni samānāksharāṇy apragrahasamjñāni tāny 'ekeshām mate bhavanty' anunāsikāni*. <sup>4</sup> *kul----- apragrahā iti kim: amī iti: 'tanā iti.* <sup>5</sup> *samānāksharāṇi 'ti kim: 'so----- pragrahāksharaçabdayor niyataliṅgatayā' paraspārānvayo ghaṭate. na pragrahā apragrahāḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. *ekeshām ācāryāṇām mate*. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-kagunāni paṭashante*. <sup>4</sup> O. ins. *am-----* <sup>(5)</sup> O. om. <sup>(6)</sup> O. *agn-----: vish-----: vāy-----* <sup>7</sup> W. *niyamat-*.

the rule, but it would have to be answered in the negative (see the counter-examples below); and the text reads accordingly. The manuscripts of the commentary give as found "in another *sākhā*," one example, read *brahmān* in W. B. (O. is wanting), and *yadghrā* in G. M.: I do not quite know what to make of this, as there seems to be no call for quoting from another text examples of what is capable of being fully illustrated from the received Veda of the school; *brahmān* is found at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice,<sup>2</sup> twice, but would be a counter-example to this rule, its *a* not being final; it is, in fact, of the same character with the first of the counter-examples given. These are *satyarājān* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>), *agnās ity āha* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>: W. has dropped out *agnās*), and *vicityaḥ somās na vicityās iti* (vi.1.9<sup>1</sup>: O. has only this).

Finally, the commentator remarks that Čāṅkhāyana and Kāṇḍamāyana also accept this principle. He may well say this, for the natural interpretation of the rule is to make it represent simply the view of those authorities; and the action of the comment, in cutting it loose from its predecessors, and declaring it alone to express the approved doctrine of the treatise, is in a high degree forced and arbitrary. It was noticed under i.58 what an unjustifiable act of violent interpretation was there committed, by way of preparation for this one. The implication of "final" is not needed in rule 8 any more than in rules 6 and 7, and is clearly enough made in them all; whence it comes, it would be the business of those who put the passage in to tell, if they could.

The Ath. Prāt. gives (at i.105) an enumeration of the protracted vowels occurring in the text to which it relates. This our treatise omits to do, and it may be well to repair the omission in this place. A final *a* is protracted at *āñs* at i.8.16<sup>2</sup> twice: ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>: vii.4.20: —*aḥ* to *āḥ* at i.4.27: v.5.1<sup>3</sup>; and to *ās* (the *h* being lost) at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: v.5.1<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup> twice: vi.1.9<sup>1</sup> twice; 3.8<sup>1</sup>; 4.3<sup>4</sup>; 6.2<sup>3</sup>: —*an* to *ān* at i.8.16<sup>1</sup> twice, 16<sup>2</sup> thrice: ii.6.5<sup>6</sup>: —*am* to *ām* at vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; 5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.7<sup>4</sup>; 5.7<sup>1</sup> twice: —*i* to *īs* at i.7.2<sup>1,4</sup>: ii.4.12<sup>6</sup>: vi.5.9<sup>1</sup>: vii.1.6<sup>1</sup>, 7<sup>4</sup>: —*iḥ* to *īḥ* or *īr* at i.5.9<sup>6</sup>: vi.3.10<sup>1</sup>: —*in* to *īn* at vii.4.20 twice: —*uḥ* to *ūr* at vi.3.8<sup>1</sup>: —*e* to *ēi* at i.4.27: vi.1.4<sup>5</sup>; and

8. *sāmnidhyād anunāsikapluṭāu' grhyete: tuṣabdaḥ prakṛtācāryamatānīvartakāḥ<sup>2</sup>: ata' eva<sup>4</sup> saṁhitāyām asaṁhitāyām<sup>5</sup> cā 'kārah padāntaḥ pluto 'nunāsiko bhavati: yady apy akāra iti<sup>6</sup> sāmānyeno 'ktaḥ: tathā 'py anvādeṣo 'ntyasya (i.58) iti vacanād apicabdo 'nunāsikadharmatayā nimittinam padāntam eva 'kāram anvādicati. yathā: suḥl-----: upa-----: 'yaḥo-----: brahmān<sup>9</sup> ity anyasyām<sup>10</sup> sākhāyām<sup>8</sup>. apicabdaḥ kimarthaḥ: <sup>11</sup>saty-----: agn-----: <sup>11</sup>vicityaḥ-----: gāṅkhāyanakāṇḍamāyanayor apy ayaṁ vidhir <sup>12</sup>akāre plute sammataḥ<sup>12</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*plute*. <sup>2</sup> O. *pūrvacārya*. <sup>3</sup> W. *eta*; M. *tata*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. om. <sup>6</sup> O. om. <sup>7</sup> B. O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *yadghrā*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *asya*. <sup>(11)</sup> O. om. <sup>(12)</sup> G. M. -*raphulās sammataḥ*.

to his treatment of it, and conjecture that, if he could only have told us what it meant, we might have found in it something to approve. We are tempted to seek in it some statement as to the accent of the protracted syllable, or *pada*; and, if it were allowed to amend *pūrvashām* to *ekeshām*, we might translate, 'some hold that the whole word in which protraction occurs is to be uttered in the same tone'—only then, to be sure, we should look for a statement of the usage actually followed in the text.

## CHAPTER XVI.

CONTENTS: 1-31, detail of the cases of occurrence, in the Sanhitā, of *ṣ* in the interior of a word, before a spirant.

### अथ सकारपराः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for cases in which *s* follows.

A simple heading, of force through a considerable part of the chapter (i. e. through rule 13). The essential item of the precept laid down was given above, in xv.4, which directed that in all the cases to be specified in this chapter is to be assumed the presence of *anusvāra* following a vowel and followed by a spirant. Words in which that spirant is *s* form by far the most numerous class, and until rule 14 they alone are treated.

The Rik Pr. is the only one of the other treatises which offers anything at all analogous with this enumeration; it (at xiii.7-10) gives rules for the occurrence of *anusvāra* after long vowels only.

### सशोहपाश पदादयः स्वरपरः ॥ २ ॥

2. *Sra*, *ṣo*, *ha*, *pā*, and *ṣa*, at the beginning of a *pada*, take *anusvāra* before a *s* that is followed by a vowel.

The commentator cites examples, as follows. For *sra*, *visrañsa-yed amehenā dhvaryuḥ* (vi.2.9<sup>4</sup>, 10<sup>7</sup>: G. M. O. have only the first word); we have other cases at ii.5.7<sup>2</sup>; v.1.6<sup>1</sup>: vii.3.10<sup>3</sup>, all from the same root, *sras*. For *ṣo*, *ṣoṣṣā modā ive 'ti* (iii.2.9<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit the last word, O. the last two); I have noted no other case: as counter-example, to show that only *o* after *ṣ* takes the increment, is given *āṣāsānā sāumanasam* (i.1.10<sup>1</sup>: O. alone has the latter

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: ita uttare grahanaviṣeshāḥ sakāraparā ity etad adhikṛtān veditavyam. sakārah paro 'yebhyas te sakāraparāḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -*shoḥ*. <sup>2</sup> B. -*para*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *yasmāt sa tathoktaḥ* (and -*paraḥ* in the rule).

विकृते अपि ॥ ३ ॥

3. Even when the vowel is altered.

That is to say, even when the vowel that is by the last rule required to follow the *s* has undergone euphonic alteration, so as to become a consonant. A single example is cited, *apahañsy agne* (iv.7.13<sup>1</sup>; p. *apa-hañsi*); if the text contains any others, they have escaped my notice.

रापूर्वश्च ॥ ४ ॥

4. As also, when they are preceded by *ra*.

This rule is made for the purpose of establishing a single additional case under the general rule given above (xvi.2), namely, the word *nārācañśibhyaḥ* (vii.5.11<sup>2</sup>); the case being one, as the comment points out, where the *ca* is not at the beginning of a *pada*. The *ca*, 'also,' brings down only *ca*; and we are assured that this is the reason why *ca* was mentioned last in rule 2, even at the cost of a violation of the natural order of the vowels. Of this point we need not make much, since the rule contains other and unexplained violations of alphabetic order.

शस्स्तान्तोदत्ते ॥ ५ ॥

5. Also in *çañśtā*, except when it is accented on the final syllable.

Here is another single case, falling under rule 2 by the suspension of one of the restrictions laid down in that rule—namely, that the *s* be followed by a vowel. The passage is *utā çañśtā suviprah* (iv.6.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *suviprah*). The restriction as to accent

3. *apiçabdaḥ svarānvādeçakah<sup>1</sup>*: *sakārāt pare tasmint svare vikṛtam āpanne 'pi vyañjanatām upagate 'pi syād' anusvātravidhiḥ<sup>3</sup>. yathā: apa-----*

<sup>1</sup> B. *sakārān-*. <sup>2</sup> W. and O.(?) *svārad*. <sup>3</sup> lacuna in O., from (*anuvāra-*) *vidhiḥ* to *svara* under the next rule.

4. *'caçabdaḥ srādiṣhu<sup>1</sup> çakāram anuvādigati<sup>2</sup>*: *etadartham eva svaravyatīyaye<sup>3</sup> 'pi çakāragrahaṇam tatrad 'nte kṛtam. rā: ity evampūrvāḥ çakārah sakāraparo 'nusrāragamam bhajate. yathā: nār----- apadādīyartho<sup>4</sup> 'yam ārambhāḥ.*

(<sup>1</sup>) W. *çabdasrādiṣhu*; B. *sacaçabādīṣhu*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. ins. *çakārah*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *vyakīyaye*; O. begins again with *vyatīyaye*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. O. *apadārtho*.

5. *çañśtā: ity etasmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe 'nantodātte<sup>2</sup> sakārapare bhavaty<sup>3</sup> anusvāragamah. uta----- anantodātta<sup>4</sup> iti kim: açv----- sraçoḥa* (xvi.2) *iti prāptāu satyām<sup>5</sup> sakārasya<sup>6</sup> svaraparavā-*

## मा पदादिरनुदात्तः ॥ ८ ॥

8. *Mā* takes *anusvāra* when beginning a *pada* and unaccented.

All the implications of rule 2 are here cut off (as is distinctly enough intimated by the express repetition of one of them, *padādi*), and hence it is to be understood that the increment takes place before a *s* whether this be or be not followed by a vowel. The examples are *āhar māñsēna* (v.7.20) and *māñspācanyāḥ* (iv.6.9<sup>1</sup>). The restriction to the beginning of a *pada* is established by quoting *śīlikamadhyamāsaḥ* (iv.6.7<sup>4</sup>); that as to the accent, by *māsam dikshitāḥ syāt* (v.6.7<sup>3</sup>: only O. has *syāt*).

So far as I have discovered, this rule applies only to forms and combinations of *māñsa*, which are not infrequent in the *Sanhitā*. The four following rules give it certain extensions and limitations.

## पुमीपूर्वश्च नित्यम् ॥ ९ ॥

9. As also when preceded by *pu* or *mī*, under all circumstances.

The closing specification of the rule amounts to a removal of the restriction as to accent, imposed in rule 8—that as to initial position being virtually removed by the prescribed prefixion of *pu* or *mī*. The examples quoted are *ut pumāñsaṁ haranti* (vi.5.10<sup>3</sup>: O. omits *haranti*, and B. runs the two citations together, having dropped out a part of each) and *mīmāñsante kārye* (vi.2.6<sup>4</sup>). We have *pumāñsam* again at iv.6.6<sup>5</sup>, and other forms of *mīmāñs* at vi.2.6<sup>4</sup> and vii.5.7<sup>1</sup>: I have noted no other words as falling under the rule.

## सकायपरश्च ॥ १० ॥

10. And when followed by *sakāya*.

The *ca*, 'and,' we are told, here brings down *mā*; and G. M. add that the intent of the rule is to establish an exception under

8. *mā*: *ity eva*n<sup>1</sup> *varṇaḥ padādir anudāttaḥ sakārūparō 'nusvārāgamam bhajate. atra nīyamābhāvāt sakārasya svarapara-  
tvābhāve 'pi nimittatvam bhavaty eva. 'yuthā<sup>2</sup>: āhar-----: māñs-  
----- padādir iti kim: śīli----- anudātta iti kim: māsam  
-----*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *ayanī*. <sup>2</sup> O. om.

9. *caṣabdo me 'ti jñāpayati: pu: mā: ity evampārvo me 'ti<sup>1</sup>  
varṇaḥ sakārūparō nīyamān anusvārāgamam bhajate. ut-----:  
mīm----- anudātatatvanivartako<sup>2</sup> nīyaṣabdaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. ins. *ayanī*. <sup>2</sup> O. *-nīyamānyāvar-*.

with *māsi*. This interpretation is, of course, forced and false: *māsi* is included with the rest here because it is an example of the same class with them; and the makers of the treatise, when they put it in, either overlooked or neglected the fact that it falls technically under rule 14, and so also under rule 17, establishing exceptions to 14. We have also *masi-māsi*, more than once, at vii.5.1<sup>6</sup>.

हि पुनिगानिवाहसिनेऽतस्सयदाताऽसात्कनीयाज्याया-  
द्राधीयार्धीयाश्रेयाहसीयावसीयाभूयाऽसोज्जिवाजघ्निवा-  
जिगिवाजीगिवातस्थिवादाश्चादीदिवापपिवापीपिवावि-  
दाविविशिवाशुश्रुवाससृवा ॥ १३ ॥

13. The following words have *anusvāra* before *s*: *hi*, *pu*, *jigā*, *jighā*, *chañsine*, *atañsayat*, *ātāñsīt*, *kanīyā*, *jyāyā*, *drāghīyā*, *ra-ghīyā*, *creyā*, *hrasīyā*, *vasīyā*, *bhūyāñsah*, *jakshivā*, *jaghnivā*, *jigivā*, *jīgivā*, *tasthivā*, *dācīvā*, *dīdīvā*, *papivā*, *pīpivā*, *vidvā*, *vivīcīvā*, *cuçruvā*, *sasrīvā*.

The commentator's examples are as follows: *hiñsīh paramē vyoman* (iv.2.10<sup>1,2,3</sup>: O. omits *vyoman*, and G. M. substitute *mā hiñsīs tanuvā*, iv.2.3<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *cinute 'hiñsāyāi* (v.2.8<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *cinute*); respecting this first specification, see further below;—*tena puñsvatīh* (ii.5.8<sup>5</sup>) and *puñsah putrān* (iv.6.9<sup>4</sup>): I have only noted farther two cases of *puñsah*, at ii.6.5<sup>5</sup> and vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>;—*lokam ajigāñsan* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: vi.5.8<sup>2</sup>: O. omits *lokam*): elsewhere only at iii.2.2<sup>3</sup>;—*vashtāram ajighāñsan* (vi.5.8<sup>4</sup>): the text presents fourteen other cases of *jighāñs*;—*brāhmanāchañsine* (i.8.18): the only case: a counter-example (but O. omits all the counter-examples), *pra yuchasy ubhe nī pāsi* (i.4.22), shows the necessity of including in the citation the *ne* of *chañsine*;—*gabhe mushtim atañsayat* (vii.4.19<sup>4</sup>), with a counter-example, *atasam na gushkam* (i.2.14<sup>2</sup>), to explain the citation of the whole word *atañsayat*;—*anvātāñsīt tvayi*, (iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>: O. omits *tvayi*), with *anu vrātāśas tava* (iv.6.7<sup>3</sup>), to prove the need of the final *it*;—*kanīyāñso devāh* (v.3.11<sup>1</sup>): the text offers half-a-dozen cases of this comparative, and about the same number of the next;—*jyāyāñso bhrātarah*

12. 'cakāro nishedhākarsahakāh': *māsi*..... *ity eteshu graha-  
neshu na syād anusvārāgamah. esham api mā padādir* (xvi.8)  
*iti prāptih. kecid atra prath*.... *ity udāharanti*: *tad asādhu*:  
*na pade dvisvare nityam*<sup>3</sup> (xvi.17) *ity anenāi 'va nishedha-  
siddheh*: *tasmād anyacākhāyām bahusvaram apuram udāhara-  
nam avadhāranīyam. daçasu*..... *shaṇ*..... *māsām*.....

(1) O. om. (2) W. -raṇam. (3) W. O. n; G. M. om. (4) W. -dham siddhah; B. -dhaḥ siddhah. (5) G. M. unyasyām ç. (6) B. G. M. param; O. om.

exposition given under rule 2 (see note on that rule) of the reason why *hi* was not there included: *hi* here is meant not as initial only, but wherever found in a word. Since, however, it is only in this one word that *hiñs-* occurs otherwise than as initial, it would seem better to have disposed of the single case as of those which form the subject of rules 6 and 10, and to put *hi* into 2, where it would look much more at home than here at the head of a troop of perfect participles and comparatives. And why *pu* was not put into rule 2 without any ceremony, I cannot see at all; unless I have overlooked some case or cases of its occurrence, *puñs* is invariably initial.

The commentator raises the question why rule xv.4 does not require us to insert an *anusvāra* before the *ś* of *dāśvā*, *vivīcivā*, and *śuśruvā*, since these too are *śrādayah*; and he makes answer that it is because the restriction conveyed in xvi.1 is still in force. But in that case, he goes on to say, is there not a nasal increment before the *s* of *hrasīyā*, *vasīyā*, *tasthivā*, and *sasṛvā*? The answer to this objection is twofold. First, the competency of the citation is pleaded—that is to say, the words being read in the rule itself without nasal, that is to be understood as their authoritative form (compare under rule 19, where this plea leads to a further discussion). Secondly, the words in question being found associated with *ātāñsīt*, *kanīyā*, *jyāyā*, and so on, all of which show the *anusvāra* to follow a long vowel, we are to infer that in the others also it does not follow a short vowel. The first of these answers is not such as is wont to be pleaded in this treatise, and the second is evidently very weak: I should almost prefer to assume that the difficulty was not remarked by the authors of the treatise, and that the commentators who have discovered it have been forced to make the best excuse they could for it.

A more serious objection to the rule, it seems to me, is that it mixes together cases of two different classes—those in which (*chanśine* etc.) the nasal appears in the word itself as cited, and those in which it is to be added before a following *s*. Of this, however, the comment takes no notice.

na syāt. atha sakāraparā<sup>13</sup> (xvi.1) ity āśhmaviṣeśasya<sup>14</sup> sakārasya<sup>15</sup> 'nuvṛttir'<sup>16</sup> iti vadāmaḥ. tarhi hrasīyāvasīyātasthivāśsrve 'ty atra 'sakārapara evā 'gamah'<sup>18</sup> kim na syāt. uccāraṇa-sāmarthyād eve 'ty prathamah<sup>17</sup> parihārah. atha vā: ātāñsītkanīyājyāye 'tyādishu sarvatra dīrghānantaram evā 'nusvārasthānam<sup>19</sup> iti sāhacaryād<sup>20</sup> atrā 'pi na syād anusvārasya hrasvānantaram<sup>20</sup> sthānam ity<sup>21</sup> aparah parihārah.

(1) B. om. (2) O. -man. (3) G. M. syāt; O. bhajate. (4) O. om. (5) G. M. ins. apy akārādi (i.52) prāptih. (6) O. om. (7) O. om. (8) O. om. (9) O. om. (10) G. M. om. (11) G. M. ins. namu. (12) O. vidvāvivīcivāśsrushāsasrve. (13) W. om. parā; G. M. -para. (14) G. M. -śhanasya. (15) G. M. O. -ter. (16) W. makārasya 'gamah; O. ... evā 'nusvārāg-. (17) G. M. -ma. (18) W. -svārah. (19) G. M. O. tatsāh-. (20) W. G. M. hrasvānt-. (21) W. iti 'ty.



## अनाकारो ह्रस्वः सांकृत्यस्य ॥ १६ ॥

16. According to Sāmkr̥tya, the vowel, except *ā*, is short.

That is to say, the two vowels *i* and *u*, to which alone reference has been made above, become short in the cases here referred to: for example, in *haviṇshi bhavanti* (v.5.1<sup>7</sup> et al.: O. omits *bhavanti*) and *samishṭayajājāṇshi juhōti* (vi.6.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit *juhōti*), where Sāmkr̥tya would read *haviṇshi* and *yajujāṇshi*, while in *vayāṇsi* (v.7.23 et al.: O. omits) he would admit the long vowel.

A curious case of dissent upon a point in grammar which we have not been accustomed to regard as open to any difference of opinion. The rule is, naturally enough, pronounced unapproved.

G. M. add *ca* to the rule, after *sāmkr̥tyasya*.

## न पदे द्विस्वरे नित्यम् ॥ १७ ॥

17. Not, under any circumstances, in a dissyllabic word.

This is a rule prescribing exceptions under rule 14; the addition *nityam*, 'under any circumstances,' confirms its application to words ending in *si* or *shi* after *ā*, *i*, or *u* which would otherwise fall under any other rule prescribing the increment.

Examples under rule 14 alone are first quoted, namely *stuto yāsi vacāṇ anu* (i.8.5<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. end with *yāsi*) and *yāsi dūtaḥ* (iii.5.5<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have dropped out *yāsi*). Then, as a case also under rule 2, we have *vidhataḥ pāsi nu tmanā* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>); and, as one under rule 8, *prathame māsi prsthāni* (vii.5.3<sup>1</sup>: G. M. omit the last word), which has been already made the subject of discussion under rule 12, above. The force of the *nityam* does not go so far as to prohibit an *anusvāra* in every dissyllabic word before *si*, what-

16. *ākārād anyo 'nākārah: ikāra ūkāraḥ ce 'ty arthaḥ: tayor eva prakṛtatvāt. sāmkr̥tyasya mata ikāra ūkāraḥ ca hrasvam āpadyate. yathā<sup>1</sup>: hav-----: sam-----. 'anākāra iti kim: vayāṇsi.<sup>2</sup>*

*ne 'dam sūtram iṣṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> O. om.

17. *dviṣvare<sup>1</sup> pade vartamānā<sup>2</sup> ākārekārokārāḥ<sup>3</sup> padāntasishiparā<sup>4</sup> nā<sup>5</sup> 'nusvārāgamam<sup>6</sup> bhajante. yathā<sup>7</sup>: stuto-----: 'yāsi----- nityaḥ padāḥ prāptyantarapratishedhārthaḥ: vidhataḥ-----: 'sraḥ oha<sup>10</sup> (xvi.2) iti prāptiḥ: prathame-----: mā padādir<sup>11</sup> (xvi.8) iti prāptiḥ. dvau svarāu yasmin<sup>12</sup> vidyete tad dviṣvaram: tasmin.<sup>9</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. *dviṣvasv*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. *-na*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *ākārah ikārah*; O. *ākāraūkārah*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-ntas sishiparo*; O. *-ntā si-*. <sup>5</sup> B. om.; G. M. *nityan nā*. <sup>6</sup> B. ins. *na*; O. ins. *nityam*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>(8)</sup> W. om. <sup>(9)</sup> B. om. <sup>10</sup> O. *-hapāḥ padādāya*. <sup>11</sup> O. *-dir ijās*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. ins. *pade*.

with *ūti*); *purudaṇṣaṇ sanim* (iv.2.4<sup>3</sup>); *vṛshadaṇṣas te dhātuḥ* (v.5.12): there is another case at v.5.21; *paṣān daṇṣakāḥ syur yad viśhācinam* (v.2.9<sup>6</sup>: O. omits the first word, and it alone has the last two); and *daṇṣstrābhyām malimlān* (iv.1.10<sup>2</sup>): there is another case at v.7.11. To the objection that the citation in the rule of *daṇṣa* simply might have saved the rehearsal of whole words [in a part of the cases given], the commentator replies by quoting *kurvato me mo 'pa dāsat* (i.6.3<sup>3</sup> et al.) as an example of cases which need to be excluded. The addition of *paraḥ*, 'in the latter place,' is because *vṛshadaṇṣaḥ* contains two places at which, by xv.4, the *anusvāra* would otherwise require to be inserted.

This last point, however, does not pass (except in O.) without farther question and discussion. The objection is raised that the mere citation of *vṛshadaṇṣa* without *anusvāra* before the former sibilant is enough to settle its reading, according to the same principle that was appealed to under rule 13, for *hrasīyā*, *vastīyā*, and so on. This is undeniable; and the only real answer to be made is that there was no harm in adding *para* here, to make the matter sure, while it could not have been employed in rule 13 without occasioning a great deal of additional trouble. The commentator, however, prefers to have recourse to a plea of exceptionally puerile character. In xv.4 (the rule here in force), he says, the spirants in general are implied, but in xvi.1 (in force at rule 13) a special spirant, *s*; and it is an acknowledged principle that, as between a generality and a specification, the specification is the more powerful. That being the case, the putting down of that

*vato.... ityādāu mā bhūd iti. 'para iti kim: vṛshadaṇṣa ity atra' sthānadavye 'pi srādishu cāi 'kapada (xv.4) iti prāptāu satyām pūrvatra' mā bhūd iti. nana grahaṇasāmartyād eva 'nusvārah,<sup>10</sup> pūrvatra nu bhuvati: yathā hrasīyāvastīyā (xvi. 13) ityādāu grahaṇasāmartyād<sup>11</sup> upapādītum. nāi 'sha doṣaḥ: srādishu cāi 'kapada (xv.4) ity atra 'śmusaṁānyam uktam: atha sakāraparā (xvi.1) ity atra tu tadviṣeṣa uktāḥ: sāmānyaviṣeṣayor viṣeṣo balavān iti nyāyaḥ: tathā sati<sup>12</sup> balavadbādhanam<sup>13</sup> eva bhūṣaṇam<sup>14</sup> na tu<sup>15</sup> durbalubādhanam<sup>16</sup> iti<sup>17</sup> tatrdi 'va grahaṇasāmartyam<sup>18</sup> samarthanīyam: na tu atra<sup>19</sup> durbalasthāne: tathā 'pi<sup>20</sup> adhikū<sup>21</sup> puruṣo virodhinam<sup>22</sup> adhikam eva bādhathe bhūṣaṇatvāt: na tu kadācid alpabalam<sup>23</sup>: iti<sup>24</sup> paraṣadduprayoga<sup>25</sup> upapadyate.*

<sup>1</sup> O. prefixes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -di. <sup>3</sup> G. M. syāt. <sup>4</sup> in W. only. <sup>5</sup> O. ins. *ity atra 'py akārādi* (1.52) *iti vacanād anusvārā-gamaḥ syāt: tan mā bhūd iti.* <sup>6</sup> G. M. -thanena. <sup>7</sup> O. om. <sup>8</sup> W. *ava.* <sup>9</sup> W. -va. <sup>10</sup> B. -rāgamaḥ. <sup>11</sup> W. *sāmartyāgrahaṇam.* <sup>12</sup> W. *balavatiyam eva bhūṣaṇam: vādhanam eva bhūṣaṇam na tu durbalam iti bādhanam.* <sup>13</sup> G. M. -vatsādih-; B. -dham. <sup>14</sup> G. M. om. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -lavīdhanam na sīdhu. <sup>16</sup> W. -nam eva sāmartyam; B. -rīhya. <sup>17</sup> B. *arīhu.* <sup>18</sup> G. M. *hi.* <sup>19</sup> G. M. ins. *loke.* <sup>20</sup> W. *ādih-;* G. M. -ka. <sup>21</sup> W. *-dhanam.* <sup>22</sup> W. B. *apy alpam.* <sup>23</sup> B. *iti 'ti.* <sup>24</sup> W. B. *atra ṣadd-*

## अक्रस्तक्रस्यतेरस्यतेभ्रशते ॥ २२ ॥

22. Also in *akraṣta*, *kraṣyate*, *raṣyate*, and *bhraṣate*.

The passages are *dyān vājy ā 'kraṣta* (vii.5.19<sup>1</sup>), *utkraṣyate svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>3</sup>), *uparaṣyate svāhā* (vii.1.19<sup>1</sup>: B. O. omit), and *nā 'smād rāṣṭram bhraṣate* (v.7.4<sup>4</sup>: O. omits the first two words); *bhraṣate* occurs also at i.6.11<sup>1</sup> twice.

G. M. read *utkraṣyate* for *kraṣyate* in the rule.

## रस्यै च ॥ २३ ॥

23. And also in *raṣhyāi*.

The only passage is *pūṣho raṣhyāi* (i.3.10<sup>2</sup>). The significance of the *ca*, 'and,' which is here out of its proper place, will be given, we are told, under the next rule.

## ऐकार उव्यस्य नितान्तः ॥ २४ ॥

24. The *āi*, according to Ukhyā, is excessive.

That is to say, according to the commentator, the *āi* of the word *raṣhyāi*, here brought forward by the *ca*, 'and,' which is read in the preceding rule. *Nītānta*, 'excessive,' is explained as signifying 'uttered with more violent effort.' The whole business is a very queer one—Ukhyā's opinion itself, its introduction here at a place where it is entirely impertinent, and the bit of interpretation whereby it is worked into the connection.

## विरित्रि संख्यासु ॥ २५ ॥

25. Also in *vi*, *ri*, and *tri*, in numerals, except in *su*.

22. 'akraṣte 'tyādishu syād anusvārāgamah'. *dyān*-----: *utkr*-----: 'upa-----: nā-----.

(<sup>1</sup>) O. substitutes a separate rehearsal of the words in the rule (except the last), and *eteshu grahaṇeshu anusvārāgamo bhavati*. (<sup>2</sup>) B. O. om.

23. *raṣhyā ity asmin grahaṇe syād anusvārāgamah*. *pūṣho*----- *cakārasya* 'vyatihāreṇ' 'nvaya' *uttarasūtre prayojanam ucyate*.

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. *vyavahārād anvayād*.

24. *raṣhyā ity asmin<sup>1</sup> grahaṇe pūṣasūtrasthacakārasamar-pita<sup>2</sup> āikāro nītānto bhavati 'ty<sup>3</sup> ukhyasya<sup>4</sup> mate<sup>5</sup>*. *nītāntas tīva-taraprayatna ity arthah*.

*nāi 'tan matum ishtam*.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> B. -*trasya cak*-; O. -*treprayasthacak*-; G. M. -*pīte*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. *iti*. <sup>4</sup> W. *ukhya*; O. *ukhyasyā* 'cārasya'. <sup>5</sup> O. -*tuin*.

26. Also in *çiñcumārah*, *çiñshat*, *sañçvā*, *sañsrā*, *sañsr̥shṭa*, *sañskṛtya*, *sañskṛta*, *sañçita*, *sañçitā*, *kiñçila*, and *kiñçilā*.

The passages, as quoted, are *sindhoḥ çiñcumāro himavataḥ* (v. 5.11: only O. has the last word); *kiṁ tata uc chñshatī 'ti yad dhiranyeshtakāḥ* (v. 5.5<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last two words, and it omits the first two); *ubhayataḥsañçvāyi kuryād avadāyā 'bhi* (ii. 6.8<sup>4</sup>: only O. has the last two words, and it leaves off *ubhayataḥ*); *sañsrāvabhāgā stha* (i.1.13<sup>2</sup>); *sañsr̥shṭajit somapāḥ* (iv.6.4<sup>1</sup>: W. B. put this after the next following example; see farther on); *garvram eva sañskṛtyā bhyādrohati* (v.6.6<sup>3-4</sup>: O. omits the first two words; and all but O. omit the last one, thus making a citation which is also found again in v.6.6<sup>4</sup>); *tan naḥ sañskṛtam* (i.4.48<sup>2</sup>); *brahmasañçito hy eṣa ghṛtāhavanah* (ii.5.9<sup>2</sup>: only O. has the last word); *garavye brahmasañçitā* (iv.6.4<sup>4</sup>); *kiñçila vanya yā ta ishuh* (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>: all but G. M. end with *te*); and *kiñçilaḥ caturtho vanyaḥ* (v.5.9<sup>2</sup>: G. M. alone have *vanyaḥ*) and *kiñçilāya ca kshayanāya ca* (iv.5.9<sup>1</sup>: O. ends with the first *ca*). The commentary prefaces the last two passages with the remark that the second citation of *kiñçila* is that of a part of a word, including a variety of cases. But this, in the first place, would imply that the reading of the rule at the end was *kiñçilakiñçila*, which is the case only in T.; and, in the second place, even were that the reading, the explanation would be a bad one, and the repeated *kiñçila* should be defined as a theme ending in *a*, and so including the declensional forms of that theme, by i.22: in fact, it was expressly cited under that rule, as an example of its application. If *kiñçilā* is the true reading (as I presume to be the case), then we must suppose that the makers of the rule intended both words as *padārikadeṣa*'s, the one involving the first two examples quoted, the other the third, and the case being quite parallel with that of *sañçita* and *sañçitā*, just preceding: but the comment has discovered a difficulty, namely, that *kiñçila* is actually a *pada* in the text (v.5.9<sup>1</sup>), and therefore cannot be quoted without ceremony as a *padārikadeṣa* (see under rule 29, where this is more distinctly brought out); and hence its efforts to amend the reading and interpretation—efforts in which it is too intent upon the end to be gained to be mindful of consistency in the means employed. In short, here as in many other places, the *Prāticākhya* is less minutely accurate in its modes of statement than the commentator would fain have it, and he undertakes to make it what it should be by forced interpretation.

26. <sup>1</sup> *çiñcumāra ityādigrahaneshu<sup>2</sup> syād anusvārāgamah. ya-  
thā: sindhoḥ..... kiṁ..... ubhay.....: sañsr.....: sañsr-  
.....: garv.....: tan.....: brahm.....: ' gar.....: kiñç-  
.....: parakiñçilagrahaṇam<sup>3</sup> padārikadeṣatayā bahupādānār-  
tham: kiñçilaḥ...: kiñçilāya..... nanu<sup>4</sup> sañsr̥shṭe 'ty atra  
shakāraparo 'nusvārāgamah kiṁ na syāt. māi 'vam: atra sūtre  
sarvatra<sup>5</sup> padādivarṇānantaram<sup>6</sup> evā 'nusvāradarṣanāt: tatsāha-*

noun *siñha*, and of forms from the roots *trñh* and *drñh*, which alone come under the action of the rule, there are other cases in the Sanhitā. Counter-examples are given (excepting in O.): to show that no other syllables take the increment before *h*, *sapatnasāhī vrāhā* (i.2.12<sup>2</sup>: but G. M. substitute *sapatnasāhīñ sam nārjmi*, i.1.10<sup>1</sup>) and *anati-dāhāyo 'vāca* (v.2.10<sup>3</sup>); that *r* takes the increment only when preceded by *t* or *d*, *grhāñām asamartyāi* (iii.3.8<sup>2</sup>); that the increment is taken only before *h*, *sishāsanañh* (vii.5.2<sup>1</sup>: G. M. read *sishāsah*, but doubtless by a blunder only), *trshvīm anu* (i.2.14<sup>1</sup>), and *naktañ dr̥çe dīpyate* (v.6.4<sup>4</sup>)

मश्चिष्ठस्य च ॥ २८ ॥

28. As also, in *mañhishthasya*.

That is to say, before the *h*, which is brought down from the preeding rule by *ca*, expressly in order to exclude the assumption of *anusvāra* before the *sh* and *s* in the same word. The passage is *mañhishthasya prabhrtasya* (iv.2.3<sup>4</sup>), and there is no other.

आदिरङ्कतिरङ्कोऽङ्कोरङ्कोमुगत्यङ्कात्रङ्कसोऽङ्क-  
साश्शमङ्शुभिरङ्शमुवाङ्श्वङ्शूत्रङ्शवोऽङ्शुरङ्शुमङ्शू-  
नङ्शुनाङ्शोरङ्शायोपाङ्श्वङ्शौ ॥ २९ ॥

29. Also, after the first vowel, in *añhatih*, *añhah*, *añhoh*, *añhemuc*, *atyañhāh*, *añhasā*, *añhasah*, *añcam*, *añcubhīh*, *añcabhuvā*, *añçu*, *añcū*, *añcavah*, *añcuh*, *añcum*, *añcūn*, *añcunā*, *añçoh*, *añçāya*, *upañçu*, and *añçāu*.

We have here a detailed list of complete *padas* (or, in one or two instances, more than a whole *pada*), in which *anusvāra* is found. The illustrative examples are as follows. For *añhatih*, *pari dñeshaso añhatih* (ii.6.11<sup>2</sup>): the only case. For *añhah*, *añhomucam vrshabhūm yajñīyānām* (i.6.12<sup>4</sup>; p. *añhah-mucam*: G. M. O. omit the last word); *añhah* is found four or five times in the Sanhitā as an independent word, and about fifteen times in the

*pūrva iti kim: sap-----: anati-----: r̥kāreñāi 'vā' lam: kim takāradakārābhyañ: gr̥h-----: evampura iti kim: sish-----: trshvīm-----: naktañ-----: hakārah paro yasmād 'asū hakāraparah.'*<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -raç ca. <sup>2</sup> O. asū hekāraparah. <sup>3</sup> B. G. M. O. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. om. eva. <sup>6</sup> G. M. sa tathoktah.

28. *mañhishthasye 'ty asmin granane cakārākr̥stuhakāraparo 'nusvādrāgamo bhavati'. yathā': mañh-----: 'cakārāñ kimarthañ: atrāi 'va grahane sashakāraparo nā bhūd iti.'*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. syāt. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. om.

same division, and in no other. For *añṣunā*, *añṣunā te añṣuḥ* (i.2. 6: G. M. O. end with *te*). For *añṣoḥ*, *yo vā añṣor āyatanam veda* (vi.6.10<sup>2</sup>: O. omits the last two words, and B. has lost the whole example, with most of the preceding one). For *añṣāya*, *añṣāya svāhā bhagāya* (i.8.13<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit *bhagāya*). For *upāñṣu*, *upāñṣusavanam yad upāñṣusavanam* (vi.4.4<sup>1</sup>: O. omits the first two words). The word *upāñṣu*, when not further compounded, is separated in *pada*-text into *upa-añṣu*, and so most of its forms come under the various citations of the cases of *añṣu* already illustrated (thus, it furnishes additional instances, not counted above, to *añṣu*, *añṣuḥ*, *añṣum*, and *añṣoḥ*, twenty in all); but in its compounds it makes, of course, a single *pada* of itself (thus, *upāñṣu-savanam*), and so has to be cited in the rule as such (we have other combinations, namely, with *pātra*, *yāja*, and *antaryāma*); and, moreover, we have one case, *upāñṣāu*, showing a form of *añṣu* which does not appear independently, and so furnishing the final citation, for which the example is *tam upāñṣāu sam asthāpayan* (vi.4.6<sup>1</sup>): there is another in the same division.

The restriction *ādih*, 'after the first vowel,' is intended to guard against any one's imagining that the *s* of *añṣasaḥ* and so on is to be preceded by *anusvāra*.

What has thus been given represents the whole comment as found in O.; the other MSS. make two or three troublesome additions, to which it is necessary to return. The last of them regards the citation of *añṣu* and its inflectional forms (namely, those that contain *añṣu* as a part, or *añṣubhiḥ*, *añṣuḥ*, *añṣum*, *añṣunā*); and, if I understand it aright, it asserts that, if *añṣu* alone were cited, the other forms would not be included, because *añṣu* itself occurs as a *pada* (and would therefore have to be taken as such, and not as a part of a word, *padādikadeṣa*); and if it be proposed to cite it with each value, as was done with *kiñṣilu* (in rule 26: see note to that rule), there remains the difficulty that, as a phonetic complex only, it would involve such cases as *paṣum paṣupate te adya* (iii.1.4<sup>1</sup>: W. omits *paṣum*)—where, namely, we have the same elements in combination, only without the *anusvāra*. With regard to *añṣa*, a somewhat similar statement appears to be made: namely, that if *añṣu* simply were quoted, it would be understood as a *pada* (being such in *añṣa-bhuvā*), and hence *añṣam* would

---

.....<sup>28</sup> *tvayā*.....<sup>24</sup> *bhruve 'ti kim: añṣe 'ty etāvata<sup>25</sup> grahaṇe*  
*tathāvidhapadasadbhāvād añṣam<sup>26</sup> ity atra na<sup>27</sup> syāt.<sup>24</sup> tenā*  
 .....<sup>28</sup> *apy akārādi (i.52) iti vacanād anañṣu.... ity apy<sup>29</sup>*  
*udāharanam.<sup>28</sup> vṛshṇo..... prāṇā.....<sup>30</sup> añṣur.....<sup>30</sup> yam*  
 .....<sup>31</sup> *añṣūn.....<sup>31</sup> añṣunā..... yo..... añṣāya.....*  
*upāñṣu..... tam.....<sup>32</sup> añṣv<sup>33</sup> ity<sup>34</sup> etāvati<sup>35</sup> grhīta itareshām*  
*aparigrahaḥ<sup>36</sup> syāt<sup>37</sup> tathāvidhapadasadbhāvāt: atho 'bhayam*  
*grhyate padam ekadeṣaḥ<sup>38</sup> ca kiñṣilavat: tathā sūti padādikadeṣe*  
*shu paṣum.... ityādishu p.āpnuyād anusvāraḥ<sup>39</sup>: tac cā 'nish-*

intent of prescription. But I have too little confidence in the correctness of this conjecture to be led to attempt amending the text into giving it consistent expression.

अवग्रह उदात्तो ऽन्सेऽन्सायाऽन्साभ्यामन्साविति ॥३०॥

30. Also in *añse*, *añsâya*, *añsâbhyâm*, and *añsôu*, when accented on the first syllable.

The term *avagraha* is declared by the commentator to be equivalent here to *âdi* or *padâdi*, 'beginning of the word.' This is, of course, wholly and entirely inadmissible, except as we are driven by the irresistible force of circumstances to give it that meaning or none. There has evidently been some blunder committed, but we can hardly venture to attempt its rectification. Not one of the words here cited occurs, or could occur, as *avagraha*, 'former member of a compound.' The restriction is made with reference to *añsôu* alone, in order to distinguish it from *asôu*. The examples are *dakshîne 'ñsa upa dadhâti* (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O omits *dadhâti*; W. has lost the whole), *çityañsâya* (vii.3.17: W. has lost *çity*), *añsâbhyâñ svâhâ* (vii.3.16<sup>2</sup>), and *uttare 'ñsâv eva prati dadhâti* (v.3.1<sup>5</sup>: O. reads *tishthati* for *dadhâti*, but doubtless by a copyist's error only); the counter-example is *asôv abravîc citra-vihâtâ* (ii.5.2<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word); *añsâbhyâm* alone is found more than once in the text (namely, again at v.7.13).

नासावा नासावा ॥३१॥

31. But not in *asôv â*.

There is a single passage where the pronoun *asôu*, in the vocative case, stands at the beginning of a clause, and is, accordingly, accented on the first syllable; hence the necessity of the present rule, establishing an exception under its predecessor. The passage is *brûyâd asôv é 'hi' ty evâm evâ* (ii.4.9<sup>3</sup>: O. alone has *eva*; G. M. omit also *evam*, and B. blunderingly reads instead of it *atra*).

The Prâtichâkhyâ's rehearsal of the cases of interior *anusvâra* is,

30. *avagraha âdir ity arthaḥ: yudî padâdir udâttaḥ syât tarhy añse* <sup>2</sup>----- *ity eteshu<sup>3</sup> syâd anusvârâgamuḥ. itigabdaḥ svarûpavâci. dakshîne*-----<sup>3</sup> *çity*-----: *añsâ*-----: *uttare*-----  
*âdir udâtta iti kim: asôv*-----

<sup>1</sup> B. *pari*. <sup>2</sup> W. *om*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *-shân*.

31. *âdyudâtte<sup>1</sup> saty apy<sup>2</sup> asôv é 'ty<sup>3</sup> usmîn 'grahane na khalu<sup>4</sup> syâd anusvârâgamuḥ. brûyâd*-----

*iti tribhâshyaratne<sup>5</sup> prâtichâkhyavivarane*  
*shodaso<sup>6</sup> 'dhyâyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *yady ud-*; B. *yady udâttaṭve*. <sup>2</sup> B. O. *om*. <sup>3</sup> W. *usiv iti ty*; B. *asiv*; G. M. O. *asôv ity*. <sup>4</sup> O. *om*. <sup>5</sup> B. *çritri*-. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. *dviṭiyapraçne caturtho*.

(v.6.1<sup>2</sup>), *yañ kāmāñ kāmāyate* (vii.1.1<sup>2</sup>: G. M. O. substitute *yañ kāmāyeta*, i.6.10<sup>4</sup> et al.), *vañcate parivañcate* (iv.5.3<sup>1</sup>), and *mañinā rūpāñi 'ndreṇa* (vii.3.14); but O. introduces after the first *tāñs te dadhāmi* (iv.1.10<sup>3</sup>) and *marīyāñ dviveça* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>), and substitutes for the last two *prāñ prā 'dravat* (v.7.10<sup>1</sup>). Counter-examples, of the weaker utterance, are *rukmañ upa dadhāti* (v.2.7<sup>2</sup>: but W. substitutes, by an evident blunder, *kūrmāñ upadadhāti*, v.2.8<sup>5</sup>), *tigmañ āyudham* (iv.7.15<sup>4</sup>), and *suglokāñs sumāñ-galāñs* (i.8.16<sup>2</sup>); O. giving instead of the last *sa imāñ lokam* (i.5.9<sup>4</sup>), and spoiling the whole illustration by adding, "in these likewise it is stronger." The first two counter-examples are evidently given for the *yama* which, by xxi.12, is to be inserted between the mute and nasal in each: the last is a case falling under xv.8, which prescribes nasalization of a protracted final *a*. The other nasal sounds are the *nāsikya* (xxi.14), and the nasal semivowels into which *m* and *n* are to be converted (v.26,28) before *l*, *y*, and *v*: these last are instanced by the phrase quoted in O. alone.

The manuscript O. follows an independent course in the exposition of this rule, as of the rest composing the chapter.

## समं सर्वत्रेति कौहलीपुत्रः ॥ २ ॥

2. Kāuhālīputra says that it is the same everywhere.

The comment interprets *samam*, 'same,' as signifying here *tivrataram*, which it had explained above as an absolute rather than a relative comparative—"very excessive," rather than "more excessive." That does not seem likely to be the real meaning. As examples, are cited, rather needlessly, *sañrarāñāñ* (iv.6.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *sañyattāñ* (i.5.1<sup>1</sup> et al.), *nyāññ agñiç cetavyāñ* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>: only O. has *cetavyāñ*), and *upahātāñs ho* (ii.6.7<sup>3</sup>). O. gives an entirely different, though equivalent, exposition, and only the last two of these examples, with two others, namely *sarvāñ agñāñr apsushadāñ* (v.6.1<sup>2</sup>) and *imāñ lokāñ* (ii.1.3<sup>1</sup>).

The name of the authority quoted is given by G. M. as Kāuhālīyaputra, and by O. as Kohālīputra, in both the text and commentary.

## अनुस्वारे ऽपिवि भारद्वाजः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Bhâradvāja says it is faint in *anusvāra*.

2. *sarvatrā 'nūñāsikavarneshu' tivrataratvañ 'samam iti' kauhālīputro<sup>3</sup> manyate. sañr-.....: sañy-.....: nyāññ-.....: upa-.....: ityādi.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*sikyav*-. G. M. -*sikyāñ v*-. <sup>2</sup> W. *sarvatve* 'ti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. (as also in the rule) -*hiyap*-.  
O. substitutes for the whole *anusvātrottamādiṣhu sarveshu samaviçeshenā 'nūñāsikyāñ syād iti kohālīputra<sup>1</sup> dātavyo manyate sma : tivrataram ity arthāñ : nyāññ*

.....: *sarvāñ*.....: *imāñ*.....: *upa*.....



*gamatavut*, 'simple conjunction;' the second, *saṅghishta*, 'fused together;' the third and fourth, only *tīratīra*, 'more excessive.' And it is added at the end (only O. making the statement intelligibly) that in other cases Čaityāyana's rule (xvii.1) applies.

## व्यञ्जनकालश्च स्वरस्यात्राधिकः ॥ ५ ॥

5. And to the vowel is added, in this case, the time of a consonant.

The "and" (*ca*) in the rule is declared to continue the implication of Old Kāuṇḍīya's opinion: according to this authority, here, in the prescription of *anusvāra*, the time of a consonant, half a *moru* (i.37), is to be added to the vowel that is accompanied by *anusvāra*; an example is *yuijāthāñ rāsabham yuram* (iv.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.). And "in this case" (*atra*, literally 'here') is added in the rule because the prescription of increased quantity is not of force in the cases detailed in the sixteenth chapter, in nasal mutes, nor where *n* or *m* is converted into *l* (v.25,26,28).

O. states the same thing in other language, giving two additional examples, *catrāñr anapavyayantañ* (iv.6.6<sup>3</sup>) and *añhomuce* (i.6.12<sup>3</sup> et al.)—of which the latter, being one of those established in the sixteenth chapter (xvi.29), ought to be a counter-example—and remarking further that in the opinion of other teachers the *anusvāra* merely was added to the vowel. *Anusvāra*, namely, was declared by i.34 to have the quantity of a short vowel; and we should be grateful if the commentator had pointed out in what relation this rule really stands to that; if, indeed, there is any connection between them, and if this does not belong properly to a doctrine that regards the *anusvāra* as an affection of the vowel merely; causing the latter's prolongation, to be sure, but not adding an element with independent quantity to it. O. appends the further restriction that the vowel undergoing prolongation is to be a simple one (not a diphthong). And it mentions another interpretation, as put forward by some authorities: that *atra* signifies wherever *anusvāra* is prescribed: and that where there is *anusvāra*, there the quantity of the vowel is to be short in every case.

5. *caḥāra sthavirakāuṇḍīnyam<sup>1</sup> anvādiḥṣati: atrā 'nuscāravi-*  
*dhāne sānūnāsikasvarasya vyañjanakālo hrasvārdhakālo 'dhikāñ*  
*syād iti sthavirañ kāuṇḍīnyo manyate: yuij-.... ityādi. atrāi*  
*'va svarasye 'ti kin.: srādiśu 'ttameshu 'ttamalabhāve' cāi<sup>3</sup> 'tad*  
*adhikakālavidhānam<sup>4</sup> mā bhād iti.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -*rah kāv*; G. M. -*nyamatam*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -*mābhā*. <sup>3</sup> B. *nāi*; G. M. *vai*.  
<sup>4</sup> W. *adhikāl*; G. M. *ādhatakāl*.

O. substitutes for the whole *atrā 'nuscāre vyañjanakālo hrasvārdhakālamātrah svarasya 'dhiko bhavati svarakālāt: catr-.... añh-.... yuij-.... caḥāda sthavirakāuṇḍīnyamatavādiḥṣati: itaricāryamate 'nuscāra eva svarasā 'dhika syāt: atre 'ti kin.: srādiśu 'ttameshu uttamalabhāve smānāksharāshu cāi 'tad adhikakālavidhāna mā bhād teshu svarakikāliko 'nuscāra syāt: apara iluñ atre 'tyanunivā-kavidhāna ity arthah: anusvārabhāve 'pi vyañjanakālo hrasvakālo bhavati yadā 'nuscāras tadā sarvatra hrasvakālo eva syāt.*

As example, is cited the first phrase of the Sanhitā, *ishe tvo 'rje tvā* (i.1.1: only O. has the last two words).

The manuscripts of the commentary leave us quite in a quandary as to the value of these seven rules, W. B. calling them approved, but G. M. O. unapproved.

नातिव्यक्तं न चाव्यक्तमेवं वर्णानुदिङ्गयेत् ।

पयःपूर्णमिवामत्रं कूर्न्धीरो ययामति ॥

इत्यात्रेय आत्रेयः ॥ ८ ॥

8. Ātreya says, one must utter the sounds not over-distinctly and not indistinctly; taking, as it were, a vessel filled with drink, steady, according to the sense.

The commentator gives only a simple paraphrase of this verse, and casts no real light upon its meaning, even as regards the naïve and not very instructive comparison in the second line.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

CONTENTS: 1-7, opinions of various authorities as to the mode of utterance of the auspicious syllable *om*.

7. *sarvavarṇāṇām prayogaḥ<sup>1</sup> svocitaprayatnaviśeṣhād<sup>2</sup> dr̥ḍha-prayatnataro<sup>3</sup> bhavati<sup>4</sup> 'ti śāitīyāyano manyate. yathā<sup>5</sup>: ishe.... ityādi.*

<sup>6</sup> *nāi 'tāni<sup>7</sup> sapta sūtrāṇi<sup>8</sup> 'śhāni.*

<sup>1</sup> B. -ga. <sup>2</sup> B. syoc.; W. B. -shū; G. M. -shāi. <sup>3</sup> W. -tnaḥ prayatnatamo; B. -tnaḥ prayatnataro. <sup>4</sup> G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> W. B. etāni.

O. substitutes for the whole śāitīyāyanaśyā "cāryasya mate svaprayatnaviśeṣhādīḥ sarvavarṇāṇāṇi vāiśeṣhādīḥ dr̥ḍhaprayatnataraḥ evaṇi varṇeshu bhavati: na svāsva-ravīramayor eve 'ti: yathā: ishe..... nāi 'tāni etc.

8. *ativyaktam<sup>1</sup> atispashtam avyaktam aspashtam ca<sup>2</sup> yathā na bhavaty evaṇi varṇāṇi udiṅguyed uccārayed<sup>3</sup> 'ity arthaḥ<sup>4</sup>: payaḥ-pūrṇam ivā<sup>5</sup> 'matraṁ kṣhīrapūritam<sup>6</sup> bhājanam<sup>7</sup> 'harann<sup>8</sup> ivā<sup>9</sup> yathāmati matim<sup>10</sup> anatikramya<sup>11</sup> dhīro<sup>12</sup> dhyetā<sup>13</sup> bhaved<sup>14</sup> ity ātreyo manyate.*

*iti tribhāshyaratne prātiśākhyavivarane  
saptadāṣa<sup>15</sup> 'dhyāyaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. nā 'tiv-. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> W. kṣhīram apū-; B. -īraparipū-; O. -īram pū- <sup>6</sup> G. M. amatram. <sup>7</sup> O. pāraṇīva. <sup>8</sup> W. O. m. <sup>9</sup> W. O. om. <sup>10</sup> G. M. dhīro; G. M. adhyatā yathā dhīro. <sup>11</sup> G. M. -vet tāhe. <sup>12</sup> G. M. O. dvitīyapragne pañcamo.

only eleven. This is a very strange fact, and calls for a wider examination of Tāittirīya manuscripts, to see if any of them have saved the lost final word.

Then is quoted a verse "from the Kālanirnaya," to the effect that "the quantity of two and a half *moras* belongs to the *pranava* and to a vowel forming the beginning or end (?) of a passage that one reads in the Veda, also at the end of a chapter or section." The Kālanirnaya quoted here and below must, of course, be a very different work from that of Mādhava bearing the same title (Weber's Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit MSS., No. 1166).

In explanation of the word *tu* in the rule, another half-verse, from which I extract no suitable meaning, is quoted from the Kālanirnaya, and the authority of Pāṇini is further appealed to to prove that among the diphthongs there is no short quantity; hence for simple *o* long quantity is determined: here, "however" (*tu*), when the diphthong stands in *pranava*, that quantity is negative; and (quoting, apparently, another half-verse) for the *pranava*, as occurring in the Veda, is prescribed long quantity along with [the quantity of?] a *m*. That is to say, the *tu* intimates a denial of the ordinary quantity of the diphthong *o*. And the remark is finally added that a difference of quantity is to be recognized in the different *pranavas*.

## उदात्तानुदात्तस्वरितानां कस्मिंश्चिदिति शैत्यायनः ॥ २ ॥

2. Śaītyāyana says it is to be uttered with either one of acute, grave, or circumflex.

The comment simply paraphrases the rule, adding nothing in its explanation—not even telling us in what relation it stands to rule 7, and whether Śaītyāyana would let us give the word, in any given case of its use, whatever accent we chose, or would have us governed by reasons in our choice between the three accents.

*nirūpitaḥ*<sup>22</sup>: *iha tu*<sup>23</sup> *pranavasthatvaviśeṣeṇā*<sup>24</sup> 'sū *kālo nishidh-yate: vedasthapranave*<sup>25</sup> *tu syāt* <sup>26</sup>*samakāradvīmātrate*<sup>27</sup> 'ti. <sup>28</sup>*pru-ṇavaviśeṣhe kālavīśeṣaḥ*<sup>29</sup> *pratyetaavyaḥ*.

<sup>1</sup> W. B. -ve; G. M. -vena. <sup>2</sup> W. B. omkā. <sup>3</sup> O. -tiyamāva. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>5</sup> B. ins. iii. <sup>6</sup> W. ardhaitiṣyamātram bruvaḥ : pranave. okdraim. <sup>7</sup> B. O. ardhā. <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. mātṛe. <sup>9</sup> G. M. -tiyas tam; O. tiyamās tam : sārādhavimāt : a ity arthah. <sup>10</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>11</sup> G. M. sam- : om : ye- : om : ish- : om : brāh- : om : dhad- : om : āt- : om : O. sam- : ye- : ish- : brah- : B. ins. ca. <sup>12</sup> B. ins. ca. <sup>13</sup> B. pranavasavaratasya <sup>14</sup> B. adhyāya- ca. <sup>15</sup> G. M. -kasya tv ante 'to 'rdhat-; O. -tiye id. <sup>16</sup> B. nu-; G. M. anta- <sup>17</sup> G. M. -dañ ca pr-; O. -dañ c: prāpavām. <sup>18</sup> O. -svo nā 'stī. <sup>19</sup> W. om. iii. <sup>20</sup> O. okārasya. <sup>21</sup> W. G. M. -le. <sup>22</sup> G. M. -te. <sup>23</sup> B. om. <sup>24</sup> O. -shād; G. M. -sha- nād. <sup>25</sup> W. B. O. -sya pr-. <sup>26</sup> B. -kālo dv-; G. M. -kāle dv-; O. -kāre dvīmātrate. <sup>27</sup> G. M. pranavasya viśeṣah.

2. udāttānūdāttasvaritāndm madhye kasmīṅ cīt svare prāṇa-vaḥ prayoktavya iti śaītyāyanō brūte. yathā: oṃ.

O. substitutes utte anudātte svarite vā eṣhā madhyatamena svareṇa prayoktavya syād i śaītyāyanamaḥ ācārya manyate : os os.

combination of high and low tone. The relation of *vāk* in the compound is described as that of a locative case, and the word is paraphrased by *vācaḥ sthāne*, 'in position (i. e., I presume, 'quality' or 'temperament:' compare xxii.11, xxiii.4,5) of voice.'

**स्वरितः प्लाक्षिप्लाक्षायणयोः ॥ ५ ॥**

5. According to Plākshi and Plākshāyana, it is circumflexed.

This rule is, along with its three predecessors, pronounced by the commentator unapproved.

**उदात्तो वाल्मीकिः ॥ ६ ॥**

6. According to Vālmīki, it is acute.

This is the only rule in the chapter, except the first, which the commentator allows to stand as approved. In his school, then, the vowel part of the sacred exclamation is to be two and a half *moras* long, and of acute tone. This agrees with the teaching of the Vāj. (ii.51) and Rik (xv.3) Prāticākhyas, save that these give (what is really equivalent to the same thing) three *moras* to the whole word *om*; and the Rik Pr. mentions other opinions both as to its quantity and its accent.

**यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषां यथाप्रयोगं वा सर्वेषाम् ॥ ७ ॥**

7. All allow that it may also be according to the application.

The commentator first quotes an absurd opinion of Māhishēya's, to the effect that *yathāprayogam*, 'according to the application,' here means *udātta*, 'acute;' but then goes on to set forth, as given by Vararuci, what appears to be the real meaning of the rule: namely, that with whatever tone the passage to be read [i. e. its beginning] is used, that tone is to be given also to the introductory exclamation. Thus, before *ishē tvā* (I.1.1 et al.), which begins with

4. *prayujyata iti prayogaḥ: madhyameno 'ccanīcasamāhāravicakṣhanena prayatnena pranavaḥ: yatra<sup>2</sup> kvacana vāca sthāne<sup>3</sup> prayogo bhavati. sa<sup>4</sup> iti kaudīnyābhīmataḥ pūrvokto grhyate. vāci prayogo vākprayogaḥ.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -vi; G. M. -vah prayoktavyah. <sup>2</sup> W. anya-. <sup>3</sup> W. B. -na. <sup>4</sup> B. om.  
O. substitutes ko 'yam prapṇvo nīna cāvaprayogaḥ [i. e. vākpr-] kaudīnyamatam  
adīṣya yatra kvacana sthāne dryate: tena madhyamena svareṇa prayoktavyah.

5. *plākshipplākshāyanayoḥ<sup>1</sup> pakshe<sup>2</sup> svarito bhavati. nāi<sup>3</sup> tat sūtracatusṭayam iṣṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> O. ins. ācāryayor. <sup>2</sup> O. mate; G. M. O. add prapṇava.

6. *vālmīker mate pranava udātto bhavati.<sup>1</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> O. adds yathā.

lowing circumflex.' He adds examples of a *vikrama* syllable in each of the four defined positions: namely *yò 'sya svò 'gnīs tám āpi* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>: G. M. O. omit the last two words), *vòdhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), *dhānvand gā'h* (iv.6.6<sup>1</sup>), and *tāsya kvà swargò lokā'h* (ii.6.5<sup>5</sup>: O. omits the last word, G. M. the last two). In the third example, the circumflex by which the *vikrama* syllable is preceded is the enclitic; this shows us (what we should have inferred without it) that, as regards the application of the present precept, no distinction is made between the independent and the enclitic circumflex. As an example of the use of the term, and showing the necessity of its definition here, is quoted rule xvii.6, where we are told that Pāushkarasādi asserts the utterance of *svāra* ('circumflex') and *vikrama* with a firmer effort. The word occurs elsewhere only at xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, where we have no assurance that it signifies the same thing as here. It is found, among the other Prātiśākhyas, in that to the Rig-Veda only, and has there no such meaning.

The *vikrama* is marked by the usual sign of low tone, the horizontal stroke beneath. The following rule, as we shall see, extends its definition so as to include nearly all the syllables so marked.

The construction of *sa* in the rule, as agreeing in gender with *vikramah*, though referring to *nīcam* (*aksharam*), was alluded to above, under v.2.

## प्रचयपूर्वश्च कौण्डिन्यस्य ॥ २ ॥

2. As also, according to Kāuṇḍinya, when a *pracaya* precedes.

The *pracaya* (see xxi.10,11) is the series of unaccented syllables following a circumflex (enclitic or independent) in connected discourse, and uttered, save the one next preceding another following circumflex or an acute, in the tone of acute. This last one of the

1. 'yatra' svaritayor' madhya' udāttayor vā' nyatarato ve' ti svaritodāttayor ve' ty arthaḥ: ' udāttasvaritayor vā' madhye nīcam yad aksharam sa vikramo' bhavati. svaritayor' madhye yathā: yo..... 'udāttayor yathā': vòdhave. svaritodāttayor yathā: dhānv-..... udāttasvaritayor yathā: tāsya..... vikramasamjñādyāḥ prayojanam: svāravikramayor dr̥ḍha-prayatnatara (xvii.6) iti.

(<sup>1</sup>) O. yad dvayor. (<sup>2</sup>) B. G. M. ins. sthale. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. ins. vā. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. om. vā. (<sup>6</sup>) G. M. ins. iti vā. (<sup>7</sup>) O. om.; G. M. put after madhye. (<sup>8</sup>) G. M. -masam jño. (<sup>9</sup>) O. tayor. (<sup>10</sup>) O. om.

2. cakdro' vikrama iti jñāpayati: 'kāuṇḍinyasya mata udātta-parāḥ svaritaparo vā pracayapūrvāḥ ca vikramo vijñeyāḥ. udāt-taparo yathā: pary-.....<sup>2</sup> svaritaparo yathā: upar-..... pra-cayāḥ pūrho yasmād 'asūn pracayapūrvāḥ.<sup>3</sup>

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. O. caṣabdo. (<sup>2</sup>) W. om. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. sa tathoktaḥ.

depression comes by vicinage from rule 1, above, where a syllable of low tone between two that are circumflexed is spoken of. This seems to me entirely inadmissible. In *yama* as a synonym of *svārīta*, and meaning 'circumflex,' I cannot in the least believe; and the designation of a case of three successive circumflexes as *dviyamapara* would be excessively awkward, even without the omission of the *ca*, 'and,' which would be needed to connect it, in that signification, with *dviyama*. On the other hand, *dviyama*, 'of double pitch,' is an entirely natural and acceptable synonym for *svārīta*, 'circumflex,' the essential characteristic of which is that it combines the high and the low tone within the limits of the same syllable; and "a circumflex followed by a circumflex" includes every possible case. The limitation "at the end" is properly enough left to be understood from the nature of the case; but that the predicate "depressed," the most important part of the precept, should remain to be inferred by vicinage only, and from the subject, not the predicate, of the two preceding rules, is not to be tolerated. And I have no doubt that the *tāh* in the rule is the predicate, and represents *vikrama*, its gender and number being adapted to those of *anumātrāh* by the grammatical figure *anyonyānvaya*, to which the commentator (see under ii. 7, v. 2) has several times appealed in other like cases. There remains, as the only difficulty, the plural number of both words: we should certainly expect rather *sā 'numātrā*; but even if we have to let this pass unexplained, it is vastly more easy to get along with than the difficulties which beset the other interpretation. One hardly dares presume to suggest that the present reading is the result of an alteration, made after the meaning given in the comment was ascribed to the rule.

The commentator goes on to quote a verse from the *Çikshā*, to the effect that the four kinds of independent circumflex (see xx. 1, 2, 4, 5) suffer *kampa* when they precede either an acute or a circumflex. This verse is (save that it gives the Tāittirīya instead of the Rik names to the accents) the same with that which is interpolated in the Rik Pr., at the end of the third chapter (iii. 19). He adds further, in another half-verse, doubtless from the same authority, that "of the remainder, there may either be the quality of acute or of circumflex, respectively;" and explains this "respectively" as

*vyavasthāgubdenā 'nena<sup>20</sup> dvividhaḥ kampa uktaḥ : saṁhitāyām svarītakampa<sup>21</sup> itaravedabhūga<sup>22</sup> udāttakampa<sup>23</sup> iti ye<sup>24</sup> kampāḥ prasiddhāḥ<sup>25</sup> teshv<sup>26</sup> etal lakṣaṇaṁ na tu kampavidhāyakam : anyathā yo . . . ityādāu kampāḥ prasajyeta.*

*ne 'danī sūtram iṣṭam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *dviy-*. <sup>2</sup> W. *noran-*; O. *noranitary-*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *trītiyayame*. <sup>4</sup> W. *yam*; M. *vā*. <sup>5</sup> O. *-tra*. <sup>6</sup> W. *niyatā*; B. *abhihitā*; G. M. *'bhīhitā*. <sup>(7)</sup> O. om. <sup>8</sup> O. *anta*. <sup>9</sup> O. *ka*. <sup>10</sup> W. B. *yādhā*. <sup>11</sup> O. *hi hai-*. <sup>12</sup> G. *nihit-*; O. *-tatvaṁ*. <sup>13</sup> B. om. <sup>14</sup> O. *-te*. <sup>15</sup> B. *-hitaḥ*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *svār-*. <sup>17</sup> W. *trav-*; M. *ccaccasi-*; O. *ccasyasv-*; G. M. *-yādā*; O. *-ye*. <sup>18</sup> O. om. <sup>19</sup> B. *-tor*; G. M. *svārilo*. <sup>20</sup> W. *nte*; O. om. *anena*. <sup>21</sup> W. *-taḥ k-*; B. *-ta uktaḥ k-*. <sup>22</sup> G. M. *-re ve-*. <sup>23</sup> W. *-itak k-*. <sup>24</sup> W. B. O. om. <sup>25</sup> G. M. om. <sup>26</sup> B. O. ins. *eva*.

the figure represents the quantity that is added to the syllable to make room for the *vikrama* tone at the end, and it gets, therefore, the *vikrama* sign. Thirdly, in the only two passages (vi.3.4<sup>2</sup>; 6.8<sup>1</sup>) in which the vowel of the circumflexed syllable is short, it is made long.

What the commentator means by declaring the rule of no force, it is not easy to say. It can hardly be that his school acknowledged no *kāmpa* at all; and we should have expected him rather to interpret into his text the usage which he and his fellow-*çākhināḥ* accepted as proper—as he has done in so many other cases. There appears to be no discordance between the teachings of the *Prāticākhya* in this chapter and the practice in the known *Tāittirīya* text (but see the note on the next rule); the former, to be sure, do not fully explain the latter; but this is the case also with the other *Vedas*.

The denial of *kāmpa* in a circumflex syllable before an acute constitutes the most important and conspicuous peculiarity in the *Tāittirīya* system of accentuation as compared with that of the *Rik* and *Atharvān*, and also puts the former at a disadvantage in respect to clearness. Its effect is to deprive us of any constant means of distinguishing whether the syllable following a circumflex is an acute, or a grave with *pracaya* tone (xxi.10); and whether that distinction shall be shown at all depends upon mere accident. For example, *sò 'smā't* and *sò 'smāt* would be accented before a pause precisely alike; and so with any number of acutes or graves following a circumflex before a pause: e. g. *sò 'smād abhavat* and *sò 'smā'd yò vā'i tát.\** And even if, instead of a pause, other syllables follow, there must be at least two grave syllables in succession to bring out the true condition of things: we see that the syllable after the circumflex is acute in *hy èshā prthi-vyā'h*, but not in *hy ètād devā'h*, and the *samhitā* does not tell us whether in *so 'smād eturhi* the *asmāt* is accented or toneless.† And so often does this ambiguity arise, that in the first chapter of the third book there are not less than twenty cases of *pracayas*, all whose syllables except the last admit of being understood as true acutes.‡ Other possible cases of ambiguity, of less frequency and importance, I pass without notice.

This same peculiarity belongs also to the existing *Tāittirīya-Brāhmaṇa* and *Āranyaka*, so that the commentator's allusion to "other parts of the *Veda*" as differing from the *Sanhitā* in respect to *kāmpa* is of doubtful meaning.

\* Thus. *सो ऽस्माद्भवत् ।* and *सो ऽस्माद्यो वै तत् ।*

† Thus. *क्षेप पृथिव्याः* and *क्षेत्तद्देवाः* and *सो ऽस्मादेतर्हि*

‡ Thus. *सो ऽकामयत प्रजाः* may be either *sò 'kāmāyata prajā'h* or *sò 'kāmāyātā prajā'h*.

*vikrama*, there given, does not apply here in the rule for *kampa*, since, by xvii.6, *vikrama* is uttered with a firmer effort of the organs, while that is not the case with *kampa*. There is nothing in either of these proposals to commend it to our acceptance. If we were ourselves to guess, we should perhaps say that the reference was to rule 4 only, which teaches *kampa* without any protraction, and that this was confessed to be a doctrine not before authoritatively taught. But we should not presume to put the conjecture forward with any confidence:

## CHAPTER XX.

CONTENTS: 1-8, names of the different kinds of circumflex, independent and enclitic; 9-12, different degrees of force of their utterance.

इवर्णीकारयोर्यवकारभावे नैप्र उदात्तयोः ॥१॥

1. When *i*, *ī*, and *u* are converted into *y* or *v*, the accent is *kshāipra*, if they were acute.

The conversion of *i*, *ī*, and *u* into *y* or *v* is by rule x.15; *ū* does not fall under such a rule on account of its being always *pragraha* (iv.5). Rule x.16 prescribes the conditions under which a circumflex accent is the result of such a conversion; and the addition of *udāttayoh* to the present rule is wholly unnecessary—a case to exercise the ingenuity of the commentator in defending the treatise from the charge of *pāṇaruktya*: but either it escapes his notice, or he declines to touch it, as beyond his powers. Of course, if it be necessary to explain here that the altered vowel is acute, it needs to be added that the following vowel is grave

5. 'pūrvaśāstraṁ nāma vikramavidhiḥ': tasminn etad anukāryam na bhavati. evaṁ vā sūtrārthaḥ: pūrvaśāstre<sup>2</sup> 'dhyāya-prathamāsūtre yā vikramasamjñō 'ktā 'sā kampavidhāv atra' na bhavati: vikramasya dr̥ḍhaprayatnatvāt<sup>4</sup> kampasya tadabhāvād iti.<sup>5</sup>

iti tribhāshyaratne prāticākhyavivarāṇe  
ekonaviṁṣo<sup>6</sup> 'dhyāyāḥ.

(1) W. -strāṇām api kram-; B. -stre 'pi yo vikr-; O. -dhiva. <sup>2</sup> O. -rvasūtre. (3) W. -dhāv yatra; G. M. sā 'tra pracayavidhāv; O. sā kampavidhāyakatvaṁ. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -matara syāt. <sup>5</sup> G. M. add dvāv arthau. <sup>6</sup> G. M. O. dvitīyapraṇe sapṭamo.

1. udāttayor ivarṇokārayor yathopadeśam<sup>1</sup> yavakārābhāve sati yaḥ svarito vihitāḥ sa kshāipra iti samjñāyate<sup>2</sup>. yathā<sup>3</sup>: vy-----: kṛdhi----- udāttayor<sup>4</sup> iti kim: va s-----: an v-----.

<sup>1</sup> W -pāt; O. -ṣe. <sup>2</sup> G. M. jñā jāyate. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om. <sup>4</sup> W. -ta.



reads -*cān*], but no such word is to be found in the Sanhitā, and it is probably only a blundering repetition of *nyañcam*), and *kvā jāgati ca* (vii.1.4<sup>3</sup>); and, from the *jatā*-text, *kvā 'syā 'sya kvā 1 kvā 'sya* (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>: B. has lost a part; it involves a case of *kampa*, with resulting prolongation, and use of the sign 1: see xix.3). Counter-examples are given in O. only: namely, of a circumflex not found in *pada*-text, *vy evā'i 'nena* (v.3.11<sup>3</sup>: the MS. has *veryāi*), *drvānnah sarpūh* (iv.1.9<sup>2</sup>; p. *drū-annah*); of one which has an acute before it, *mārtyañ āvivēya* (v.7.9<sup>1</sup>) and *sārvāñ agnīn* (v.6.12<sup>2</sup>). We have also one of the common attempts to give a profound significance to the word *tu*, 'but,' in the rule; and, as usual, it is abortive, involving difficulties which the commentator only pretends to get rid of. He says the *tu* signifies that, so far as the *nitya* circumflex etc. (i. e. and the other varieties of the independent circumflex) are concerned, the exception laid down in rule xiv.31—namely, that the circumflex character is not retained before a following acute or circumflex—has no force. But it is objected, with entire reason, that rule xiv.31 has nothing to do with the *nitya* at all, but only with the enclitic accent prescribed in rule xiv.29. His reply is, that in the condition of complete separation of sounds, there is, after all, a grave element preceded by an acute, as required in rule xiv.29, the combination of the two, by i.40, giving the circumflex character. Whether this implies his recognition of the fact that the semivowel in every *nitya* syllable really represents an acute vowel, pronounced as such in an earlier stage of the language—*kvā* being equivalent to *kūa*, and *kanyā* to *kanā*—admits of question. He expounds *anudāttapurve* as a descriptive instead of a possessive compound, and *apūrve* as a substantive of the same character, as if the construction were 'there being a preceding grave, or there being no preceding accent;' it is doubtless better to supply in *idea tasminn akshare*, and to render 'when that syllable is' etc. The remaining bit of exposition is much corrupted in its readings, and the drift of it is not clear to me. O. brings it in very differently from the rest, and makes it involve an additional example, *yājyā'i ' 'vā'i 'nam* (ii.3.5<sup>3</sup>; p. *yājyā : ā' : evā : enam*).

*pūrvatvāt<sup>15</sup> svaritasye 'ti nishedhavishayatvam. anudāttas cā 'sdu pūrvas cā 'nudāttapūrvah<sup>16</sup>: tasmin<sup>17</sup>. 'pūrvābhāvo 'pūrvah<sup>18</sup>: tasmin<sup>17</sup>. 'cūnye tu sarvatrapūrvatvāt<sup>19</sup> pūrvatvaviśeṣaṇādva-  
yasyā<sup>20</sup> 'nyathā<sup>21</sup> vāiyarthiyāt<sup>21</sup>: tasmāt tatra<sup>22</sup> nityasvaritatvam<sup>23</sup>  
eva na<sup>24</sup> sainjñāntaram iti vijñeyam.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. om.; G. M. add *yatra svaryate*. <sup>2</sup> O. ins. *vā*. <sup>3</sup> B. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *vā*. <sup>5</sup> G. om. <sup>6</sup> O. *pī*. <sup>7</sup> W. B. ins. *anyañcam* <sup>8</sup> G. M. O. -*darkav*; O. -*shaya*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. na *tu*. <sup>10</sup> O. *nish*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *svaritam*. <sup>12</sup> O. *laksh*. <sup>13</sup> all MSS. have the lingual *l*. <sup>14</sup> W. -*rvam*. <sup>15</sup> W. B. *ucyate pū*. <sup>16</sup> W. ins. *tasmāt*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. om. <sup>18</sup> O. na *cūnye ity arihah* : *sthite pada itī kim* : *vy* ---- : *drv* ---- : *anudāttapūrvā itī kim* : *mar* ---- : *sar* ---- : *kicid ev m ūcuh* : *yāj* ---- : *ity dāi* : *prātihañniṣa* : *karṇy evakārṇh* : *pud* : *samucaye anudāttapūrvatvāt* : G. M. *cūnyapūrvasapūrvatvāt* : W. . . . *sarvatrā* ; B. *bhūnye* etc. <sup>19</sup> W. *pūrvaviśeṣad* ; B. *pūrvaviśeṣanād* ; O. *pūrvavī*. <sup>20</sup> O. *nathā*. <sup>21</sup> W. -*thyam* ; G. M. -*thyam syāt*. <sup>22</sup> W. *am* ; B. *iat* ; O. *tra*. <sup>23</sup> W. O. *nityatvam* ; B. *svaritatvam nityatvam*. <sup>24</sup> B. *ca*.

If this be indeed the original intent of the rule, it would seem that, to the apprehension of the Hindu phonetists, there was difference enough between the enclitic circumflex which *te* in *tām te* assumes in *samhitā*, having been grave in *pada*-text, and that which the *shāh* of *duçcākshāh* has in *samhitā* as well as in *pada*, to furnish ground for a difference of classification and nomenclature.\* But there are various obstacles in the way of our accepting the interpretation as satisfactory. In the first place, why ought not the same distinction to apply where the acute and circumflex are separated by a hiatus, as well as by consonants? or why, when a circumflex after an acute in the same word is called *tāirovyañjana*, alike whether a hiatus or consonants intervene, should a circumflex after an acute in another word have a different name according as it is preceded by a consonant or not? In the second place, why should the rule be thrust in here, wholly out of connection with the others respecting the enclitic circumflex, and with such a frightful sacrifice of that economy of expression which the *sātrakāra* proverbially rates so highly? for, following rule 7, a simple *nānūpadasthāt tu prātihataḥ* would have done the whole business, and much more unequivocally. Not one of the other treatises mixes together thus the enclitic and independent *svaritas*, when they come to be defined and named. Nor, again, does any other authority found a separate species of accent upon the basis here laid down. I have been inclined, therefore, to conjecture that the rule ought to be rendered 'when there is besides (*api*) a [preceding] acute in another word, then, provided a circumflex arises as the result of a rule of combination, it is *prātihata*.' understanding an independent *svarita* (except a *nitya*) to be intended, whenever that *svarita* was preceded by an acute, and so held a position which would make it an enclitic *svarita* as well; and the reason for thus calling attention to it being that, as written, it is not distinguished from a mere enclitic accent.† But there are too many difficulties connected with this interpretation also to allow of its being accepted as at all satisfactory.

The Vājasaneyi-Prātiçākhyā (i.118) gives a special name, *tāirovirāma*, to the enclitic circumflex which falls in the *pada*-text upon the first syllable of the second member of a compound, under

\* And this difference, it should be noted, applies in the same manner where division is made between the two parts of a compound word; for the extant Tāittirīya *pada*-text, in marked contrast with those of the other Vedās, regards the *avagraha* pause as suspending, like the *acusaṇa*, all accentual influence, and writes *çukrā-vati*, for example, in the same fashion as it writes *çukrām*: *asti*—that is to say,

शुक्रवती । instead of शुक्रवती. as the rest would read.

† For example, *ghṛtā'ir vy ūdyate* (iii.1.114) and *ānaçānā'h svishṭim* (iii.1.92) are written precisely as if they were *ghṛtā'ir vy ūdyate* and *ānaçānā'h svishṭim*; namely,

घृतैर्व्यद्यते and आनशानाः स्विष्टिम्: this is an ambiguity which

is common to all the Vedic texts.

## तस्मादकारलोपे अभिनिहृतः ॥ ४ ॥

4. After such a one, in case of the loss of an *a*, it is *abhinihata*.

The word *tasmāt* the comment explains as bringing down *nānā-padasthām udāttam* from the preceding rule: 'after an acute occurring in another word.' But the specification (like that of *udāttayoh* in rule 1) is wholly unnecessary: rule xii.9 prescribes the circumflex and defines its conditions: here we need only to have given us the name by which it is to be called.

O. has an independent exposition, but of equivalent meaning.

The examples are *sò 'bravāt* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *tò 'bruvan* (ii.5.1<sup>3</sup> et al.); and a counter-example, where, as the eliding diphthong is not acute, no circumflex results, is *bhrā'jo 'si devā'nām* (ii.4.3<sup>2</sup>).

All the other treatises (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.55) give to this circumflex the name *abhinihita*, of which our own term has the aspect of being an artificial variation.

## उभावे प्रस्लिष्टः ॥ ५ ॥

5. Where an *ū* results, it is *praçliṣṭa*.

Rule x.17 prescribes the circumflex to which the name of *praçliṣṭa* is here assigned; and the examples given are to be found there also, being all the instances save one which the Sanhitā affords. They read in this place *sūnnīyam iva* (vi.2.4<sup>1</sup>), *sū'dgātā* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>), *māsū 'tīṣṭhan* (vii.5.2<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *mā*), and *dikshū 'padādhāti* (v.5.5<sup>4</sup>: G. M. O. omit).

The same name (or, in the Ath. Pr., *praçliṣṭa*) is given by the other treatises to the circumflex which results from the fusion of two short *i*'s, the first acute and the other circumflex (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.56).

## पदविवृत्यां पादवृत्तः ॥ ६ ॥

6. Where there is a hiatus between two words, it is *pādavṛtta*.

Here there is abrupt change, without notice, from the independent to the enclitic circumflex. The examples given are *tā' asmāt sṛṣṭā'h* (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup>: B. omits *sṛṣṭā'h*), *sā idhānū'h* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), and *yā*

4. 'tasmān nānāpadastho'uttāt parabhūtānudanāttākārasya' lope sati yaḥ svaritaḥ so 'bhinihato reditavyaḥ'. yathā: so----: te ----: tasmād iti kim: bhrājo----

(1) O. substitutes *tasmāt sūnnī* na na svayamānārādhe te: sadakāle asvarita ity arthah: akāralupte ya svara dīṣyate so 'bhinihato nāma svarito bhavati. <sup>3</sup> W. B. -dāttasya; G. M. parabhūtād anudāttasya 'kārasya.

5. ūbhāve yatra svaryate su praçliṣṭo reditavyaḥ. sūn-----: sūd-----: māsū-----: 'dikshū-----'

(1) G. M. O. om.

*asi* (i.2.5<sup>2</sup> et al.), *sá índro* 'manyata' (vii.1.5<sup>5</sup>: G. M. omit *sa*), *tád ágvo* 'bhavat' (v.3.12<sup>1</sup>), *prāṭgam* (iv.4.2<sup>1</sup>), and *tám tváshṭā* "'dhat-ta' (i.5.1<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word). It is very odd—but, I presume, merely accidental—that in every one of these cases (except *prāṭgam*) the vowel which finally shows the circumflex is not of the same word with the acute, but belongs to another word which has been combined with its predecessor, and, after the combination, gets the circumflex by the general rules xiv.29,30 (for the commentator has expressly denied under rule x.12 that the initial grave *a* of *asya*, for example, receives the circumflex in virtue of its combination with the enclitic circumflex *tī* of *yunjāntī*). I do not see why, in the first two cases, at any rate, the circumflex is not *prātihata*, according to the commentator's explanation of the meaning of that term; and should even incline to conjecture that these are the examples selected and current for the present rule before the erroneous interpretation of rule 3 was established.

No one of the other *Prāticākhyas* limits *tāirovyañjana* to an enclitic circumflex following its acute in the same word (see note to Ath. Pr. iii.62); it is quite an oversight, therefore, that the St. Petersburg lexicon gives the term only this restricted meaning (perpetuating Roth's original error, referred to above, in the note to rule 3).

## इति स्वारनामधेयानि ॥ ८ ॥

8. These are the names of the circumflex accents.

The commentator simply gives examples for each accent, in part new, in part the same with those furnished under the rules defining each: namely, for the *kshāipra* (omitted in G. M.), *abhy āshṭāt* (iv.2.8<sup>1</sup>) and *ādhvaryó* 'veh' (vi.4.8<sup>4</sup>: this is a blunder, there being no *kshāipra* in the phrase; B. O. read instead *adhvaryūh* [vi.2.9<sup>4</sup> et al.], which does not mend the matter); for the *nitya*, *vāyavyām* (i.8.7<sup>1</sup> et al.) and *kvā* 'sya' (v.7.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. have *kva* simply); for the *prātihata*, *sá te lokāh* (v.7.26: G. M. omit *lokāh*) and *yāt tvā kruddhāh* (i.5.4<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *kruddhāh*); for the *abhinihata*, *só* 'bravī' (ii.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.); for the *praglishta*, *sādgātā* (vii.1.8<sup>1</sup>); for the *pādavṛtta*, *tā enam* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>: W. reads, blunderingly, *tām nemīm* [ii.6.11<sup>1</sup>], and B. substitutes *sā idhānāh*, iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>); and for the *tāirovyañjana*, *māma nāma* (i.5.10<sup>1</sup>).

## नैप्रनित्ययोर्द्वितरः ॥ ९ ॥

8. *ity etāni sapta svaritanāmadheyāny<sup>1</sup> ākhyātāni<sup>2</sup>. yathā:*  
*<sup>3</sup>abhy-----: adh----- iti kshāiprah<sup>3</sup>. vāy-----: kvā----- iti*  
*nityah. sa-----: yat----- iti prātihatah. so----- ity abhinihatah.*  
*sādg----- iti praglishtah. tā----- iti pādavṛttah. māma----- iti*  
*tāirovyañjanah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. -māny; B. -yāni svaritanām. <sup>2</sup> O. vyākṣ-. <sup>3</sup> G. M. om.

*Alpatara*, 'feebler,' is doubtless meant to signify a still less degree of force of utterance than *mṛdutarā*, 'gentler.'

To the commentator, his *Çikshā* appears to be a higher authority than the *Prāticākhya*, at least in this part; and he adds that, although the qualifications 'feeble, gentle, firm' are here attributed to the accents in question, yet, in accordance with what the *Çikshā* says, "like a candle, like a rush-leaf" (? unintelligible without the context), it is to be understood that there is softheadedness (?) in them all alike. And O. adds an example, *yúvā kuvīh* (i.3.14<sup>1</sup>).

## CHAPTER XXI.

CONTENTS: 1-9, division of consonants in syllabication; 10-11, *pracnya* accent; 12-13, *yamas* or uasal counterparts; 14, *nāsikya*; 15-16, *svarabhakti*.

### वञ्जनः स्वराङ्गम् ॥ १ ॥

#### 1. The consonant is adjunct of a vowel.

This brief principle calls forth a long discussion. Reference is first made (except in G. M.) to rule xxiv.5, as, by its requirement of a comprehension of *aṅga*, 'adjunct' (literally 'limb, member'), creating a necessity for the present precept (and for those that are to follow). Objection is then at once taken to the principle: if, in such cases as *kāpa* and *yāpa* (and G. M. add yet other words as illustrations), it is the consonant that indicates the difference of meaning, ought not the vowel, rather, to be considered as adjunct

1. <sup>1</sup> *vyañjanāni svarāṅgam bhavati: śvāso nādo 'ṅgam eva ca* (xxiv.5) *iti vijñeyatvena<sup>2</sup> vidhānād ayaṁ ārambhaḥ. nana<sup>3</sup> kāpo yāpa<sup>4</sup> ityādāu vyāñjanam evā 'rthaviśeshabodhakam<sup>5</sup> iti svarō vyāñjanāṅgam kiṁ na<sup>6</sup> syāt. ucyate: vyāñjanam kevalam avasthātum na śaknoti: kiṁ tu sāpeksham<sup>7</sup>: svaras tu nirapekshaḥ<sup>8</sup>: sāpekshanirapekshayor nirapeksham eva viśiṣṭam ācakshate prekshāvantaḥ: viśiṣṭapratyaṅgatvam<sup>9</sup> aviśiṣṭasyāi<sup>10</sup>*

*'va. kiṁ ca: svaruvāviśiṣṭyabodhakam anyad api vidyate<sup>11</sup>.*

*dūrbalasya yathā rāśtram harate<sup>12</sup> balavān nrpaḥ:*

*dūrbalam vyāñjanam tadvad dharate<sup>13</sup> balavānt svarāḥ.<sup>14</sup>*

<sup>15</sup> *kiṁ ca: śikshāvyaḍkhyāne*

*yaḥ svayam rājate tam tu svaram āha patañjaliḥ:*

*uparisthāyina tena vyaṅgam vyañjanam ucyate.<sup>16</sup>*

*svaras tu<sup>18</sup> brāhmaṇā jñeyā ityādi.*

*udāttag cā 'nudāttag ca<sup>17</sup> svaritaḥ ca svaras trayāḥ<sup>18</sup>:*

*<sup>19</sup>hrasvo dīrghaḥ pluta iti<sup>19</sup> kālato<sup>20</sup> niyamā<sup>21</sup> acī<sup>22</sup> 'ti<sup>23</sup>*

Next we pass to the consideration of another reason why the principle stated in the rule needed to be laid down. The consonant (by i.37) has half a *mora* of quantity; and a vowel has [for example] a *mora*: their combination, then, would seem to have a *mora* and a half, and so would be liable to be understood as of long quantity: this untoward conclusion is avoided by the present rule, which implies that in fluent utterance the quantity of the vowel belongs in all cases to the combination of consonant and vowel, and not to the vowel alone. The specification "in fluent utterance" (literally, 'in running action') is made in order to save the significance of rule i.37.

Finally, the superiority of the vowel is once more inferred from the fact that, when it is combined with a consonant, it alone is perceptible; just as, when milk and water are mingled, the milk alone is perceived, and not the water.

तत्परस्वरम् ॥ २ ॥

2. And it belongs to the following vowel.

The commentator explains *parasvaram* as a descriptive compound (*karmadhāraya*), governed by *bhajate* understood; such an ellipsis, however, is so violent as to be hardly admissible, and the word is perhaps better taken as a possessive (*bahuvrīhi*), somewhat anomalously used. The occasion of the rule, we are told, is the doubt which is liable to arise as to when the consonant—which, owing to its having the vowel as a superior, is unable to stand by itself—is an adjunct of the preceding, and when of the following vowel. A single phrase is quoted as example, namely *imān eva lokān upadhāya* (v.5.5<sup>3</sup>; O. omits the last word).

This is the leading and introductory principle in all the Prātiśākhya (see note to Ath. Pr. i.55); it is greatly restricted in its application by the following rules.

अवसितं पूर्वस्य ॥ ३ ॥

3. A consonant in *pausa* belongs to the preceding vowel.

The commentator explains *avasitam* as meaning 'standing at the end of a *pada*,' and gives as examples *urk* (i.2.2<sup>2</sup> et al.: W. has instead *rk* [iv.7.9<sup>1</sup> et al.], and O. has *vāk* [i.3.9<sup>1</sup> et al.]), *vashat*

2. *svarapradhānatayā kevalam avasthātum asahamānam*<sup>1</sup> *vyāñjanam kadā pūrvasyā 'ñgaṁ*<sup>2</sup> *kadā parasyā 'ñgam*<sup>3</sup> *iti samdehe*<sup>4</sup> *vyavasthāpayati: tad aṅgabhūtaṁ*<sup>5</sup> *vyāñjanam parasvaram bhajate. yathā*<sup>6</sup> *imān----- paraḥ cā 'sau svaraḥ ca parasvaraḥ*<sup>7</sup> *taṁ*<sup>8</sup> *svaraparam*<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. om. <sup>3</sup> W. O. om.; G. M. *kadācid apar-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *-hani*. <sup>5</sup> W. *aṅgab-*; O. *egasūtratvān*. <sup>6</sup> B. om. <sup>7</sup> W. ins. *param svari*. <sup>8</sup> O. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. O. om.

The manuscripts of the commentary are more than usually defective in this neighborhood: B. has lost the present rule, with something of what precedes and follows it; O. omits the next rule, with passages before and after; W. has done the same, to a somewhat less extent; but rule 5 and the lacking part of its comment were apparently restored on the margin of W.'s original, and its copyist has put them in the wrong place, next before rule 6.

## परेण चासंस्कृतम् ॥ ५ ॥

5. And one that is not combined with the following vowel.

The comment supplies the word *svareṇa*, 'vowel,' as that with which *pareṇa* here agrees, and the whole interpretation is constructed accordingly. The meaning is, then, that (with the exceptions to be further specified in the following rules) only the final member of a group of consonants is to be adjoined to the following vowel, the rest belonging to that which precedes. By way of illustration is given merely *tat savitūḥ* (i.5.8<sup>4</sup> et al.): a most insufficient and ill-chosen example; since, in the final form of the group *ts*, only one consonant goes with the preceding syllable: thus, *t-ts*. But the commentator is obliged to spend his strength, and vainly, in endeavoring to refute an obvious objection to the rule itself, which he thus states: "well, but then the foregoing rule is meaningless, since by this one also the quality of adjunction to the preceding vowel is assured to the consonant that begins a group." And he replies, "you must not think that: for, in such cases as *maryāçrīḥ* (iv.1.2<sup>5</sup> et al.) and *arvā 'si* (i.7.8<sup>1</sup> et al.), in which the *y* and *v* are doubled after *r* by rule xiv.4, the former *y* or *v* is by the present rule made an adjunct of the preceding vowel, but the *r*, by rule 7 below, would become an adjunct of the following vowel: and that is impossible, since no such pronunciation ever takes place. So, as one or the other must needs be annulled, the question arises which is to be annulled; and here rule 4 comes in to settle the question."

This is not a very acceptable exposition, although it in a manner involves the true relations. Rule 4 is not meant as a safeguard against the misapplication of following precepts, but as a fundamental principle, with reference to which the present rule stands in a subordinate position; and the two must be understood as if they read "the first member of a group belongs to the preceding vowel; and, along with it, such other members as are not immediately combined with the following vowel." The former principle obtains everywhere, without exception; to the latter, rules 7-9

5. 'pareṇa' svareṇa' saṁskṛtaṁ<sup>4</sup> asaṁyuktāni<sup>5</sup> vyañjanam<sup>6</sup> pārasavarāṅgam bhavati'. yathā<sup>6</sup>: tat----- nanu tarhi pārasavarāṅgam anarthakam: saṁyogādibhūtasya<sup>7</sup> 'pi vyañjanasya<sup>8</sup> 'nendī 'va' pārasavarāṅgatvasiddheḥ. mātī 'vam maṁsthāḥ<sup>8</sup>: maryāçrīḥ: arvā 'si: ity atra yavakḍrayo rephāt param ca (xiv.

of original simple pairs, there are eighty like *k-ky* (from *ky*) and *k-khsh* (from *ksh*), in which, by rules 7 and 9, only the initial consonant of the finally resulting group goes with the preceding vowel.

When, now, the pairs here rehearsed come to be extended to triplets by the addition of a third member, if that member be a semivowel, or a spirant (sibilant) following a mute, the point of division remains just where it was before. And so also, of course, in the like extension of the groups mentioned under rule 4, above, as undergoing no change in the *varnakrama*. Thus, *ggr* (*g-gr*) is divided like *gg* (*g-g*); *gcy* (*gcy-cy*) like *gc* (*gcy-c*); *ñksh* (*ñ-khsh*) like *ñk* (*ñ-k*); and *rks* (*rk-khs*) like *rk* (*rk-k*). And the very great majority (one hundred and fifty-four) of the groups of three consonants occurring in the *Sanhitā* have a semivowel as their final member; with final sibilant there are only seven.

If, on the other hand, double groups are extended to triplets by appending a mute, either non-nasal or nasal (which happens in thirty-one cases), the point of division is, by the operation of the present rule, shifted toward the end of the group. Thus, we have

1. *ñ-k*, but *ñk-t*, two groups; and *ñ-ch*, but *ñj-jñ*, two groups;
2. *rk-k*, but *rk-kc*, five groups; and *rj-j*, but *rj-jm*, five groups;
3. *dd-gh*, but *ddgh-ghn*, two groups;
4. *sst-t*, but *sstt-tñ*, two groups;

which are extensions of the groups of two members already treated of, and advance the division only one point. But further, groups ending in a sibilant, and falling under rule 9, below, and those which by rule 15 have *svarabhakti*, exhibit, when a mute is added, a still greater transference forward of the point of division, and we have

5. *k-khs* (*ks*), but *kkhst-t* (*kst*), four groups; and *k-khsh* (*ksh*), but *kkhshp-pm* (*kshm*), five groups; and, finally,
6. *r'-sh* (*rsh*), but *rshst-t* (*rsh̥t*); and *r'-ç*, but *rççp-pm* (*rçm*), three groups.

In the yet further extension to groups of four members, the same principles prevail. There are found nineteen such groups in which the additional letter, being a semivowel, has no effect upon the division; and only three in which the division is altered by an added mute. These last are: *ñkshst-tñ* (*ñkshñ*), from *ñksh*; *hkhst-tñ* (*hkhñ*), from *h-khsh* (*hkh*); and *ntst-t* (*ntst*), from *n-ths* (*nts*).

Finally, the only two groups of five consonants occurring in the

*tatra niçcāyakatvena*<sup>19</sup> *saṁyogādī*<sup>20</sup> (xxi.4) *sūtram upatishthate*.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. om., with the rule; W. puts, with the rule, at the end of the comment, having here also *pūrvavarāṅgam bhavati*. <sup>2</sup> B. *svar-*; W. adds *svaraṇa*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. *śāṁh-* (as also in the rule). <sup>4</sup> W. ins. *ca*; G. M. ins. *yad*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *tat*. <sup>6</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> W. *-dabh-*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. om. <sup>9</sup> G. M. ins. *ca*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *śāṁh-*. <sup>11</sup> O. *-tva*. <sup>12</sup> O. *-tñ*. <sup>13</sup> W. B. om. <sup>14</sup> O. *-tva*. <sup>15</sup> O. *-tñ*. <sup>16</sup> W. B. *anyaddā-*. <sup>17</sup> O. *cāryam*. <sup>18</sup> G. M. *-ha syāt*. <sup>19</sup> W. *niçcayato-*; B. *niçcayato-*. <sup>20</sup> G. M. *-dī*. <sup>21</sup> O. *iva tñ*.



*Anusvāra* appears here once more with the distinct value of a consonantal element following the vowel—and yet not as a full consonant, else it would fall under rule 4 above, and would require no separate treatment. The treatise is not so explicit as were to be desired in defining what is to be done with it in syllabication; but I presume we may infer that it does not count as *saṁyogādi* at all, but only as if an affection of the preceding vowel; and hence, that all the groups which it introduces are to be divided as if it were not there; that *ñce*, for example, is to be made into *ñcc-c*, *ñsm* into *ñssp-ṣm*, and *ñstr* into *ñsst-tr*. The example given by the commentator is *aṅgunā te* (i.2.6); but it is an ill-chosen one, and quite worthless, as, in any view of the nature and treatment of *anusvāra*, no question could arise as to the division *aṅ-gunā*.

For *svarabhakti*, see the concluding rules of this chapter (xxi. 15,16). The example given is *gārhu-pat-tyah* (i.6.7<sup>1</sup> et al.), which we are to read and divide *gār-hu-pat-tyah*.

## नातस्यापरमसवर्णम् ॥ ७ ॥

7. But not a consonant that is followed by a semivowel, if dissimilar with it.

The negative here signifies a direct reversal of the implication, as it denotes a denial of adjunction to the preceding vowel, and hence necessarily involves adjunction to the one that follows, since the consonant cannot stand by itself. "Dissimilar" is simply explained by *vilakṣaṇa*, 'of diverse characteristics, different'; it excludes from the operation of the rule the doubled semivowel itself, and would also exclude the nasal semivowel into which *n* and *m* are converted before *l*, and *m* before *y* and *v* (v.26,28), if these occurred where the rule could apply, which is not the case.

The examples quoted by the commentator are *adhyavasūya* *diḡah* (vi.1.5<sup>1</sup>; i. e. *ad-dhya-*), *madhumiḡrena* (v.2.8<sup>6</sup> et al.; i. e. *miḡ-re-*), *aḡlomayā* (vi.1.6<sup>7</sup>; i. e. *aḡ-glo-*), and *iṣhe tvā* (i.1.1 et al.; i. e. *i-ṣhet-tvā*): they are not to be commended as at all fully illustrating the wide range of application of the rule. This has been sufficiently set forth above, under rule 5. It helps to determine the division of one-third of the groups of two consonants, of four-fifths of those of three, of six-sevenths of those of four, and of all those of five—or of four-sevenths of the whole number of consonant

7. *nakārah pārcasvarāṅyatravyāvartakah: antasthāparam vyañjanam tasyā antasthāyā asvarnam vilakṣaṇam pārcasvarāṅyam na bhavati: arthāt paravarāṅyam 'tad iti vedītevyam': 'svata sthātiṁ aḡkyatāt'. yathā: adhy-----: madh-----: aḡl-----: iṣhe-----: antasthā parā yasmat tad antasthāparam. asvarnam iti kin: pari-----.*

<sup>(1)</sup> Cf. M. *iti vijñeyam*; O. om. <sup>(2)</sup> O. puts at end of comment on preceding rule; B. *svaram cūā sthā*. <sup>(3)</sup> O. om.

included too much. The meaning is clear: that a spirant which itself belongs to the following syllable, as being either directly combined with the vowel of the latter (xxi.5) or followed only by a semivowel before that vowel (xxi.7), carries with it a preceding mute; but if, on the other hand, it be cut off from the succeeding vowel by a mute, so as itself to belong to the antecedent syllable, a mute before it goes, of course, to the same syllable. The examples given in the comment are this time well selected, and illustrate the three cases involved: they are *shatt sam padyunte* (v.4.3<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *vashatt svāhā* (vii.3.12); in both of them a *t* is inserted, by rule v.33, between the *t* and *s*, and the final reading and division is *tt-ths* and *tt-thsv*. As counter-example we have *akshnayā vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.), where, after all rules are satisfied, we have *kkhsht-tn*.

As compared with those to which rule 7 applies, the consonant groups falling under this rule are few, only forty-six in all; in thirty of which the spirant carries the mute before it to the following vowel, while in the remaining sixteen both go together to the one that precedes. The detail is as follows.

Of double groups, composed of a single mute and spirant, there are seven: for example, *k-khsh* (*ksh*).

Of groups containing three consonants, the largest class is that formed by the addition of a semivowel to the preceding: for example, *k-khshy* (*kshy*): it contains ten groups. Then there are two like *ñ-khsh* (*ñksh*), three like *tt-khsh* (*tksh*), and the isolated *rk-khs* (*rks*).

Of groups of four consonants there are seven on this side, all but one (*rtt-ths=rtts*) like those of three, but with an added semivowel, which does not (xxi.7) change the division.

On the other side, where the spirant goes back to the vowel of the antecedent syllable, there are, of course, no groups of two consonants. Of groups of three we have nine, four with following non-nasal mute (as *kkhst-t=kst*), and five with following nasal (as *kkhsht-tn=kshn*). Of groups of four, there are two (as *tthst-tr=tstr*) formed from the foregoing with added semivowel, and three from triplets ending in a sibilant increased by a mute, either non-nasal (namely *nthst-t=ntst*) or nasal (as *ñkhsht-tn=ñkshn*). The two groups of five consonants, which also belong here, have been given above, under rule 7.

This finishes the subject of the division of consonant-groups in syllabication, the special elaborateness and intricacy of whose treat-

9. *pūrvac cakāro nāsikyā* (xxi.8) *ity anena samuccayavācukah: uttaras tu parasvarāṅgatvākarshakah: āshmapara sparṇac ca parasvarāṅgam bhavati: asāv<sup>1</sup> āshma<sup>2</sup> paraṇ cet<sup>3</sup> parasvarāṅgam<sup>4</sup> ced ity arthah. shat----- vashat----- āshmaparaṇ ced iti kim: aksh----- āshma puro yasmād asāv āshmaparaṇ.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. cakāro 'pi. <sup>2</sup> B asā. <sup>3</sup> MSS. -ma. <sup>4</sup> W. cen na; O. cen : sha. <sup>5</sup> W. B. -gaṇ; O. -ga.

of writing the accent might not have been without influence on the theory as to its character—that is to say, that the Vedic phonetists may have come by an afterthought to declare the *pracaya* syllables of acute tone, and to pronounce them so, *because* they agreed with the acute in being without a sign of accent, while originally no such correspondence in character was perceived or intended to be signified. The conjecture will doubtless have appeared to many somewhat wild, but I think that in studying the development of the Hindu theory respecting accent it at any rate deserves to be taken fully into account and carefully considered. I am far from regarding it at present as anything more than a conjecture; yet one or two matters have come to light since it was put forth which at least add to its plausibility. Haug, namely, in a valuable and interesting communication from India to the Journal of the German Oriental Society (vol. xvii., 1863, p. 799 ff.), shows that the modern Hindu reciters of the Veda give tonic distinction only to the syllables that have the accent-signs, the *svārīta* and *anudātta*, so that the *udātta* appears to be no accent at all, and is entirely confounded with the toneless *pracaya*—thus, under the influence of the mode of written designation, turning topsy-turvy, as it were, the whole system of spoken accent. And again, the peculiar system of writing the accent practised in the *Çatapatha-Brāhmaṇa* (which uses only one sign, the horizontal stroke beneath the syllable, applied in all the other known systems to mark the *anudātta* tone), has been turned in later times into a peculiar system of accenting, and treatises have been written to explain and teach it as such (see Kielhorn and Weber, in Weber's *Indische Studien*, x. 397 ff.\*).

The commentator points out that two grave syllables, or even one, following the circumflex, receive the character of *pracaya* (of course, with the restriction made in the next rule), and not more than two only, as is literally signified by the plural *anudātātām* in the rule. To show that the conversion into *pracaya* is limited to grave syllables, he quotes *agnāye prāvate* (ii.4.1<sup>2</sup> et al.); to show that the conversion is made only in *samhitā*, he gives part of the other passage in *pada*-form, namely *agne : dudhra : gahya : kiṇṇila : vānya* (Ō. adds *yā*). We might naturally infer from this that the *pracaya* accent does not occur at all in *pada*-text; but the inference is not a necessary one (since the rule only says that syllables which are *anudātta* in their *pada*-form become *pracaya* in *samhitā*, without implying that there may not be *pracayas* in *pada*-text which remain such in *samhitā*), and would doubtless be erroneous; for at least the extant *pada*-text of the *Tāittirīya-Samhitā* agrees in this respect with those of the other Vedas, and writes *gīrvanase*, *antārikṣham*, and *samāguchante*, for example,

\* It ought to be added, that Haug and Kielhorn do not look at the matter in the same light in which I have placed it, but incline to believe in the reality and antiquity of what I have called the modern and artificially substituted systems: this is no place to discuss the subject; but I feel confident that the view I have taken will prove the only one tenable.

grave following a *pracaya*, as well as to one that comes immediately after a circumflex.

## स्पर्शादनुत्तमादुत्तमपरादानुपूर्व्यान्नासिक्वाः ॥ १२ ॥

12. After a non-nasal mute, when it is followed by a nasal, are inserted, in their order, nose-sounds.

Which nose-sounds, as we are told in the next rule, some call *yamas*; and by this familiar name, which the other *Prāṭigākhyas* apply to them directly, we shall here, as we have done elsewhere, know them. The treatise teaches us nothing more about them, except (ii.49-51) that their place of production is either the nose or the mouth and nose, and that the producing organ is as in the series of mutes; and farther (xxi.8), that in syllabication they are to be reckoned with the following vowel.

The theory of these curious and equivocal constituents of the ancient Hindu alphabet I have discussed pretty fully in the note to Ath. Pr. i.99, and I have no new light to throw upon the subject here. They are transition-sounds, assumed to intervene between non-nasal and following nasal, as a kind of nasal counterpart to the non-nasal, and therefore called its *yama* or 'twin.'

The meaning of *anupūrvyāt*, 'in their order,' is ambiguous, as it might be understood to refer to the order either of the twenty non-nasal mutes or of the five nasals; or, of the four kinds of non-nasal mutes in each series—in which last sense the comment understands it, declaring that the first *yama* follows a first mute, the second a second, and so on; and he has before (under i.1) reckoned the *yamas* as four in the catalogue of alphabetic sounds. I have pointed out under ii.51 how difficult it is to reconcile this view with that of a variation of their organ of production as in the five series of mutes.

The commentator's examples are *tam prathānā* (i.4.9), *vimath-nānā* (iii.5.4<sup>3</sup>), *vidmā te āgne* (iv.2.2<sup>1</sup>: O. omits *agne*), and *dārāni dadhmāsi* (iv.1.10<sup>1</sup>)—one, namely, for each of the four classes of mutes. As rule xiv.24 expressly enjoins duplication of the non-nasal mute in these combinations, we are to read and divide *prathānā*, *viddāma*, and so on. The counter-examples (of which all but the last are lost in W.) are as follows: to show that the insertion is made only after a mute, *kalmāshi bhavati* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>: O. substitutes *brahmavādīnā*, i.7.1<sup>4</sup> et q.); that this mute must be a

12. *uttamaparād anuttamāt sparṣād<sup>1</sup> anupūrvyād yathākramam nāsikyā āgamā bhavanti: prathamāsparṣāt prathamānāsikyā<sup>2</sup>: dvitīyād<sup>3</sup> dvitīyā<sup>4</sup>: evam<sup>5</sup> anyatrā<sup>6</sup> 'pi.' yathā<sup>7</sup>: tam ..... vim-.....: vidmā.....: dār-.....: ityādi. sparṣād iti kim: 'kalm-.....: anuttamād iti kim: sumn-.....: uttamaparād iti kim:<sup>8</sup> sabdah.....*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *parata*; O. ins. *parah*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -*kyā*. <sup>3</sup> O. -*yasparṣād*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. -*yā*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *anye*. <sup>6</sup> O, om. <sup>7</sup> W. om.

not understand); and the sense is, that a nose-sound is imposed upon the *h* itself, or that the latter becomes nasal. It is not difficult to see on what this theory of the quality of a *h* preceding a nasal is founded—namely, a recognition of the fact that such a *h* is really an expiration of breath through the nose: it being not less true of *h* before a semivowel or nasal than before a vowel, that it is (borrowing the phraseology of an earlier rule, ii.47) *udāyavarṇādisasthāna*, ‘produced in the position of the succeeding letter.’ The commentator’s exposition might have come from the “some authorities” to whom the doctrine of that rule is attributed.

The examples given are *ahnām ketuh* (ii.4.14<sup>1</sup>), *aparādhne* (ii.1.25<sup>2</sup>), and *brahmavādinah* (i.7.14<sup>3</sup> et al.). Giving to the rule its real meaning, and applying the principle laid down at xxi.8 for the syllabic division, we should read *ahh-nām*: and so with the rest. As was suggested under Ath. Pr. i.100, it is probably this separation of the *h* from the nasal in syllabication that has led to the division of the two in point of utterance, and then to the thrusting in between them of a transition-sound.

G. M. have adapted the reading of the rule to the new interpretation, and give *hakāran nanūmaparan nāsikyam* (the writing of *n* instead of *m* before *n* is frequent with these MSS.).

## रेफोष्मसंयोगे रेफस्वरभक्तिः ॥ १५ ॥

15. In the combination of *r* and a spirant, there is a *svara-bhakti* of *r*.

The doctrine of our Prātiśākhya respecting the *svarabhakti* is less detailed, and less distinctly expressed, than that of the other treatises (for which, see the note to Ath. Prāt. i.101–2); from the statement here made, we should not even understand that this “vowel-fragment” is to be an insertion between the *r* and the spirant, although that is doubtless intended to be signified. The commentator enters into a long exposition of the subject; by no means, however, limiting himself to explaining and illustrating his text. The two South-Indian manuscripts (G. M.) are in some parts of this exposition fuller than the rest, and will be followed

15. ‘*rephasya co*’ *’shmaṇaṣ ca saṁnyoge sati*’ *rephasvarabhaktir iti jānīyāt*: *’svarasya bhak iḥ svarabhaktiḥ*: *yo* *’sya rephasya samānasvaras*’ *tadbhaktiḥ syāt*: *ṛkāraṣ cā* *’sya jihvāgrakaraṇatvena*’ *raṣṛutyā cā* *’samānadharmuḥ*: *’bhaktir avayava ekadeṣa iti yāvāt*: *etaḍ uktam bhavati*: *ṛkāravayavo*’ *bhavati* *’ty arthaḥ*. *sūtrenā* *’nenu svarabhaktir eva*’ *vihīta*: *’svarabhaktisvarūpam tu*<sup>10</sup> *vispasṭam*<sup>11</sup> *vyācashte vararuciḥ*: *’ṛkāradīr anumatrā*<sup>12</sup> *repho* *’rdhamātrā madhye geshā*<sup>14</sup> *’svarabhaktir ii*’<sup>15</sup>. *asyā* *’yam arthaḥ*<sup>12</sup>:

*indriyavishayo*<sup>16</sup> *yo*<sup>17</sup> *’sātv anur ity ucyate budhdāḥ*:

*caturbhīr*<sup>18</sup> *’anubhīr mātṛāpurimāṇam*<sup>19</sup> *’iti smṛtam*.<sup>20</sup>

So much by way of (would-be) explanation of the rule. But the commentator goes on to say that the Çikshā teaches other *svarabhakti*'s, to the number of five: namely, the *kareṇu*, between *r* and *h*, as in *barhiḥ* (i.1.2<sup>1</sup> et al.); the *karvini*, between *l* and *h*, as in *malhāḥ* (ii.1.2<sup>4</sup>); the *harini*, between *r* and *ç* or *s*, as in *darçapūrnāmāsāu* (ii.2.5<sup>4</sup> et al.) and *barsam* (ii.5.7<sup>1</sup>); the *hāritā* (or *haritā*), between *l* and *ç*, as in *suhasravaiçāḥ* (vi.3.3<sup>3</sup>); and the *hānsapaddā* (or *hānsapādā*), between *r* and *sh*, as in *varshādhvām* (ii.4.10<sup>3</sup>)—and he who wants to go to heaven (on the score, no doubt, of patience, faith, and punctiliousness) must utter the five kinds of *bhakti*, as thus laid down. It appears, then, that the commentator's Çikshā, like the Vāj. Pr. (iv.16), regards *l*, not less than *r*, as followed by *svarabhakti* before a spirant.

## न क्रमे प्रथमपरे प्रथमपरे ॥ १६ ॥

16. But not in case of *krama*, when a first mute follows the spirant.

The commentator defines *krama* as the equivalent of *dvitva*, 'duplication,' and refers as authority to rule xxiv.5, where the word occurs again without, according to him, admitting any other meaning; whence, he infers, it must signify the same thing here also. We should rather turn the argument the other way, and say that, as *krama* can have no other meaning here, it may be conjectured to signify the same thing at xxiv.5. He further coolly

"*yā tu hānsapaddā nāma sā tu*" *rephashakādrayoh:*

"*evam pañcavidhām bhaktim uccaret svargakāmukah.*"

(1) G. M. *reph-shmanos sayyoge satī tatra śhmasayyuko.* (2) G. M. *svarabhaktir iti kim: idrçī svarasya bhakti s svarabhaktiḥ bhaktir iḥogah:* *avayava iti ekade;a iti yvat;* B. O. om. *svarabhaktiḥ.* (3) G. M. O. *-naka-anāst-*. (4) O. *-ṇena.* (5) G. M. *grwyā.* (6) W. *yana.* (7) G. M. om.; O. *-ra ity arihaḥ.* (8) W. O. *rkārū eva yū;* G. M. *rkārasyā 'vay.* (9) G. M. *evam.* (10) B. om. (11) O. *spa-*. (12) G. M. *svara tāvat kiniviciḥṭi iti cet shodāçā* "dītaḥ svarāḥ (i.5) iti svar-samjñoktaṁ tesu rkārarephayos samānastīdanakaraṇatvād rkāra-varasyāi 'va bhaktiḥ rkāras tāvat kiniviciḥṭa iti cet rkāralkārāu hr-svāu (i.31) iti hravatvād ekamātro bhaved dhrasva iti ekamātraka rkārāḥ vararucināç 'vam uktāṁ mātṛikasya rkārasyā "dau svarasyā 'numātrah rephasyā', dhamātro madhye 'nta svarasyā 'numātri: iti: anu-mātra iti kin. (13) B. *-trādām api.* (14) O. *çesha.* (15) B. om.; O. *anumātrā.* (16) W. *nish;* G. M. *-dryāv-*. (17) B. O. om. (18) W. O. *-tur.* (19) W. *mātrāprayānam;* B. *-trāgramānam;* G. M. *-na.* (20) G. M. ins. *asyā 'yam arthaḥ.* (21) B. G. M. *-tra.* (22) G. M. *-trah.* (23) G. M. *ante.* (24) W. *-trah;* G. M. *-tra.* (25) G. M. ins. *rkārāma-dhyava:ini.* (26) G. M. *vibh-*. (27) O. om. (28) G. M. *-rā.* (29) W. B. O. *-sa/ñh-*. (30) W. B. *bhājyate;* G. M. O. *bhājate.* (31) G. M. *tulo doe svarabhakti vidyele arāhamātrika-svarabhaktiḥ kutra vā tishṭhati.* (32) W. *atra.* (33) W. om.; B. *kā.* (34) G. M. ins. *evam.* (35) W. B. *-yā.* (36) W. B. *-yā.* (37) B. O. *ca.* (38) W. *-tā.* (39) W. *-tā.* (40) O. om. (41) G. M. *sūtreṇo 'kkīkramena syāt svarabhaktiḥ.* (42) G. M. O. ins. *api.* (43) O. om. (44) G. M. *har-*. (45) G. M. *-pāde.* (46) G. M. ins. *kidṛçya etā iti cet.* (47) W. B. *nyu;* G. M. *-num.* (48) B. *hayor;* G. M. *hūrayor.* (49) W. B. G. M. *vidyāt.* (50) W. B. *ra-çayor yoge;* G. *çasurām jñeyā;* M. *çasām jñeyā.* (51) G. M. *har-*. (52) G. M. *svara-bhaktiḥ hānsapaddām vidyād.* (53) O. om.; G. M. *-muka iti: yathā: karēnuḥ: barhiḥ: yathā karvini: malhāḥ: harini: darçapūrnāmāsāu: barsam: hāritā: sahasravaiçāḥ: hānsapaddā: varshādhvām ityādi.*

## शब्दः प्रकृतिः सर्ववर्णानाम् ॥ १ ॥

1. Tone is the material of all articulate sounds.

The putting-together, as well as the material, of this and the following chapter is rather peculiar, and makes the impression of a supplement to the *Prāṭicākhya* proper. This present rule and its successor are akin with the first two of the next chapter, and all these with the rules of the second chapter. As under ii.1, the commentator explains *ṣabda* by *dhvani*; for *prakṛti* he gives as synonym *mālakāraṇam*, 'radical cause;' and *varṇa* he declares to designate the whole congeries of vowels and consonants.

## तस्य रूपान्यत्वे वर्णान्यत्वम् ॥ २ ॥

2. In the difference of form of the former consists the difference of the latter.

That is to say, in the difference resulting from the variety of positions giving audible quality: compare ii.3.

## तत्र शब्दद्रव्याण्युदाहरिष्यामः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Here we will instance the offices of terms.

A complete and violent change of subject is introduced by this rule, continuing to rule 9; which last, again, attaches itself closely enough to the beginning of the chapter to have been its natural continuation. The intervening batch of rules looks like an interpolation, thrust in at this point *apropos* of *ṣabda* in rule 1; the word being taken here, however, in an entirely different sense. The commentator tries to smooth over the transition by pronouncing *ṣabda* a synonym of *śāstra*, 'text-book, body of doctrine;' which latter is formed by the putting to use of combinations of the alphabetic sounds just above spoken of. He distinctly ascribes to *dravya* the sense of 'office, aim,' as the connection also requires,

1. *sarvavarṇānām*<sup>1</sup> *ṣabdo*<sup>2</sup> *dhvaniḥ prakṛtir mālakāraṇam bhavati: varṇaṣabdēna svaravyaṅjanātmaḥ rūcīr ucyate. sarve ca te varṇāḥ ca sarvavarṇāḥ*<sup>3</sup>: *teshām*<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *nāma*. <sup>3</sup> O. om. <sup>4</sup> G. M. add *sarvavarṇānām*.

2. *prāṭigrutkasthānubhedāt*<sup>1</sup> *tasya*<sup>2</sup> *prakṛtibhūtasya*<sup>3</sup> *rūpān-  
yātve sati varṇānyatvam syāt*<sup>4</sup>. *yathā: a: i: u: ityādi*.

<sup>1</sup> B. *prat*; G. M. *nād bhe*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. ins. *ṣabdasya*. <sup>3</sup> W. *pratibh*. <sup>4</sup> O. om.

3. *teshām varṇānām sarvatra*<sup>1</sup> *saṅghātāprayoge*<sup>2</sup> *śāstram*<sup>3</sup> *ity*<sup>4</sup> *ucyate: tasya ṣabdo*<sup>5</sup> *iti paryāyanāma: tatra tasmiñ chāstre  
yāni dravyāni bhavanti tāny udāharishyāmaḥ. yat karma yena  
kriyate*<sup>6</sup> *taḥ*<sup>7</sup> *tasya dravyam*<sup>8</sup> *sādhanaṁ iti yāvāt*<sup>9</sup>: *yathā gha-*

tendency to put into them (especially into *tu*) a meaning which they were never intended to bear.

वेति वैभाषिकः ॥ ७ ॥

7. *Vā* is alternative.

Rule ii.50 is quoted as example.

नेति प्रतिषेधकः ॥ ८ ॥

8. *Na* is prohibitive.

The example this time is xiii.15 (G. M. substituting xiv.14); and in it appear again some of the differences of reading which were noted in the rule itself where it occurred.

आयामो दारुण्यमणुना खस्येत्युच्चैः कराणि शब्दस्य ॥ ९ ॥

9. Tension, hardness, smallness of aperture, are producers of high tone.

Reference is made to rule i.38, in which the acute accent is defined as consisting in high tone; and the present precept is declared to be given for the sake of that, and in order to prohibit that slack or indifferent utterance which prevails in common life, *Āyāma*, 'tension,' is explained as meaning rather 'extension (literally 'longness') of the members;' *dārunya*, as 'severity of the vowel;' and *anuta khasya*, as 'closure of the orifice of the throat:' this is what one who would utter a sound in high tone must do.

There is evidently much more guess-work than true observation in this rule and the one next following: if they had been given as definitions of sonant and surd utterance, instead of high and low

*nivṛttiḥ: yatrā 'thaṣabdas tatrā 'dhikārah: yatrāi 'vaṣabdas tatrā 'vadhāranam<sup>2</sup> veditavyam. yathā: ephas tu rasya (i.19): 'atha sañhitāyām ekapṛāṇabhāve<sup>3</sup> (v.1).<sup>3</sup> sparṣa<sup>5</sup> evāi 'keshām ācāryāṇām (xiv.3). viśeṣeṇa nivartuyati 'ti vini-vartakah: adhikaroṭi 'ty adhikārakah<sup>4</sup>: avadhārayati 'ty avadhārakah.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -mam. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. ins. ce 'ti. <sup>3</sup> G. M. atha nakāro pakāram (vii. 1). <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -ṣapara. <sup>6</sup> W. O. G. M. -rah.

7. *ve 'ty esha ṣabdo vāibhāshiko<sup>1</sup> vāikalpiko bhavati. yathā: mukhanāsikyā vā (ii.50).*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -shako (as also in the rule).

8. *ne 'ty esha ṣabdah pratishedhako bhavati: yathā: 'na shumnognir (xiii.15) iti.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. syāt. <sup>2</sup> G. M. atha na (xiv.14): B. na sushu; O. -na sum-; W. B. -gni 'ti.



these positions or qualities?" the subject is continued in the next rule.

## तत्रैकविंशतिर्यमाः ॥ १२॥

12. In them are twenty-one tones.

For the application of these tones or keys, also, we are referred to a later passage (xxiii.11 etc.). As synonym of *yama* is given *svara*, 'tone.'

The commentator chooses to connect these rules with those that follow in the next chapter, and to overlook the obvious fact that in the two chapters we have separate and independent statements upon the same subject, which cannot have come from the same hand, and of which the second renders the first wholly superfluous.

## ऋग्विरामः पदविरामो विवृत्तिविरामः समानपदवि- वृत्तिविरामस्त्रिमात्रो द्विमात्र एकमात्रो ऽर्धमात्र इत्या- नुपूर्व्येण ॥ १३ ॥

13. The verse-pause, *pada*-pause, pause for hiatus, and pause for hiatus in the interior of a word, are respectively of three *moras*, two *moras*, one *mora*, and a half-*mora*.

As example of the pause of three *moras* at the end of a verse is quoted *ubhā vājasya sātaye huve vām* : (i.5.5<sup>2</sup> : O. omits the first two words); of the pause of two *moras*, in *pada*-text, between the *padas*, *ishe* : *tvā* : *ūrje* : *tvā* (i.1.1 et al.) :<sup>1</sup> and, for all that, the *Prātiçākhyā* tells us, we are to regard the *avagraha* pause, dividing the two parts of a compound word, as of the same length (the *Rik* [i.6, r. 29] and *Vājasaneyi* [v.1] *Prātiçākhyas* give it only one *mora*); of the hiatus-pause, *sa idhānah* (iv.4.4<sup>5</sup>), *ta enam* (ii.3.11<sup>4</sup>), and *tā asmāt* (ii.4.4<sup>1</sup> : W. prefixes *ā*, but doubtless only by

*trītiyam* : *eteshām*<sup>3</sup> *sthānānām* *prayojanam* *uttaratra*<sup>4</sup> *vakshyate*.  
<sup>1</sup> *etāni sthānāni keshām ityapekshāyām āha parasūtram*<sup>5</sup>.

(1) G. M. om. (2) O. 'ty etāni. (3) G. M. O. *esh*. (4) B. *ituratra*. (5) O. om.

12. *teshu*<sup>1</sup> *sthāneshu* *ekaviṅcatir yamāḥ svarā bhavanti* : *teshām yamānām* *uttaratra* *prayojanam* *vakshyate*.

<sup>1</sup> O. *tatra trishu*; B. adds *trishu*.

13. *ṛgvirāmādayas trimātrādikāldā*<sup>1</sup> *yathākramam*<sup>2</sup> *bhavanti*.  
*yathā*<sup>3</sup> : *ubhā* : : *ity ṛgvirāmāḥ* : *ishe* : : *iti padavirāmāḥ* :  
*sa* : : *ta* : : *tā* : : *iti vivṛttivirāmāḥ* : *prauḡam* *iti samā-*  
*napadavivṛttivirāmāḥ*. 'ṛci' *virāma ṛgvirāmāḥ* : *padasya virā-*  
*māḥ padavirāmāḥ* : *padadvayavivṛttāu*<sup>4</sup> *virāmo vivṛttivirāmāḥ*<sup>5</sup>.  
*gikshāyām*<sup>6</sup> *asya viçeshu uktāḥ* :

The commentator instances the different kinds of "heavy" syllable, as follows: one ending with a consonant, *māte 'va putram* (iv.2.3<sup>2</sup> et al.: G. M. omit); one long by its vowel, *te te 'dhipatayaḥ* (iv.4.11<sup>3</sup>: G. M. omit the last word); one followed by a consonant-group, *aḥmā ca me* (iv.7.5<sup>1</sup>: W. has *ānmāyinaḥ*, which appears to be merely a corrupt reading; I have found nothing at all like it in the *Sanhitā*); one that is nasal, *viñṣatyāi* (vii.2.13 et al.).

The distinction of the syllable as "heavy" or "light" has value only in a metrical point of view, and does not make its appearance elsewhere in our treatise (except as it is referred to in rule xxiv.5—which rule we might have expected the commentator to quote here, as the occasion of this one). The quality of "long" or "short" belongs to the vowel alone, and (see xxi.1 and its comment) the consonants accompanying the latter are regarded as absorbed into it, and forming part of its natural quantity. This separation of "heavy" and "long," or of weight and quantity, is practically convenient, perhaps, but theoretically indefensible; and we have reason to be surprised that phonetic observers so acute as the Hindus had not worked the theory of syllabic quantity into a more consistent shape. The other treatises agree with this: see *Ath. Pr.* i.51–54, and notes.

The use of the word *anunāsika* in describing a syllable containing *anusvāra* is (as already noted, under ii.30) one more sign of a theory which regards the *anusvāra* as a quality and not an element. The *Ath. Prāt.*, which holds this theory, uses the same term in its definition (i.53). It deserves to be noted, however, that to read *anusvāram* instead of *anunāsikam* in the verse would help the metre, making the four *pādas* similar.

This rule is enough by itself to determine the weight of any syllable whatever: but, as the commentator points out, the one following is added to resolve any doubts which might after all arise as to what syllables were light.

14. *vyañjanāntaṇi yad aksharam: 'vyañjanam ante' yasya tad*  
*vyañjanāntam: 'yad u cā 'pi dīrgham ' aksharam: ' saṁyoga-*  
*pūrvam ca yad aksharam: 'saṁyogāt pūrvam' saṁyogapūrvam':*  
*tathā 'nunāsikam: sīnunāsikaṇi' yad aksharam: uktāny etāni*  
*sarvāny aksharāṇi gurāṇi vidyāt: jānīyāt. yathā 'vyañjanānt-*  
*am: māte.....' yathā dīrgham: te..... yathā' saṁyogapūrv-*  
*vam: aḥmā..... yathā 'nunāsikam': viñṣatyāi. ' ceshāny*  
*ato 'nyāni ' : ata' ebhyo gurubhyaḥ ceshāny anyāny aksharāṇi*  
*'tato 'nantaram' laghāni vijānīyāt'. ceshāni' kānī. 'ty āgaṇkyo*  
*'ttaraḥlokēna' vivrṇoti.*

(<sup>1</sup>) G. M. put at beginning. (<sup>2</sup>) G. M. -*tanī*. (<sup>3</sup>) G. M. ins. *yad*. (<sup>4</sup>) G. M. ins. *yogāt*  
*pūrvam*. (<sup>5</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>6</sup>) B. G. M. om.; O. -*gaṇi*. (<sup>7</sup>) O. om.; G. M. *anu*. (<sup>8</sup>) G.  
M. *vyañjanāntam ity atra*. (<sup>9</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>10</sup>) O. puts before *yathā*. (<sup>11</sup>) B. omits from  
here to the middle of rule 15 (beginning again with *saṁyogapūrvam*). (<sup>12</sup>) G. M. O.  
ins. *tato laghāni*. (<sup>13</sup>) W. *eta*. (<sup>14</sup>) G. M. om. (<sup>15</sup>) G. M. *jān*. (<sup>16</sup>) W. -*ṇi* 'tī. (<sup>17</sup>) W. -*ke*.

It was hardly worth while to give a rule introductory to so very brief a treatment of the subject as is here to follow.

अनुप्रदानात्संस्पर्गात्स्थानात्करणविन्ययात् ।

जायते वर्णविशेष्यं परिमाणाच्च पञ्चमाद् इति ॥ २ ॥

2. 'The differentiation of articulate sounds arises from emission, closure, position, disposition of producing organ, and, fifthly, from quantity.

That is to say, according as any sound is different from another in respect to one or more of these five constituent or determining elements, so its nature or quality is different. The *anuprādāna* is the emitted material, whether tone, breath, or the intermediate *h*-sound (ii.8-10); by *saṁsarga* (a term not elsewhere used) is doubtless intended the degree of approximation of the articulating organs, as contact (*sparśana*, ii.33), approach (*upasaṁhāra*, ii.31), and the like (ii.14,16,45 etc.); *sthāna*, 'place, position,' and *karana*, 'producing organ,' are the familiar names given respectively to the more passive and the more active of the two parts of the mouth by whose contact or approach the sound receives its articulate character (*vinnyāsa*, which the commentator explains by *vinnyāsa* [B. reads this in the rule itself], seems to be added more to make up the verse than for the sake of its meaning); *parimāṇa*, 'measure' (used only here), is synonymous with *kāla*, 'time, quantity' (see i.31-37). The commentator takes *a* as an example, and says of it that its "emitted material" is tone; its "closure," in the throat; its "position," the two jaws; and its "disposition of producing organ," the two lips. Excepting in the first item, this is blundering work: *a* is, of all the alphabetic sounds, the one least easy to try by the tests laid down in this rule; and the commentator would have done well to choose some more manageable illustration.

वर्णपृक्तः शब्दो वाच उत्पत्तिः ॥ ३ ॥

3. Sound combined with articulation is the origin of voice.

The commentator defines *prkta* by *miçra*, 'mixed,' and *utpatti*

2. *anuprādānādibhiḥ pañcabhiḥ<sup>1</sup> karaṇāṁ varṇavāciṣeṣhyāṁ<sup>2</sup> jāyate. akārasya tāvad anuprādānam nādaḥ: saṁsargāḥ kaṇṭhe: sthānam hanū: karaṇavinnyaya<sup>3</sup> oṣṭhāu: vinnyayo nāma vinnyāsaḥ: parimānam<sup>4</sup> mātrākālah: evaṁ sarvavarṇānām boddhavyam. viçeshabhāvo<sup>5</sup> vāciṣeṣhyam: varṇānām vāciṣeṣhyam varṇavāciṣeṣhyam<sup>6</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. -ṇānām v-. <sup>3</sup> O. -nyāsa. <sup>4</sup> W. O. *parim-*, as also (with T.) in the rule. <sup>5</sup> G. M. O. -śhasya bh-. <sup>6</sup> W. O. om.; G. M. *tathā*.

3. *prkto miçra ity arthaḥ: varṇamiçraḥ<sup>1</sup> śabdo vāco vākyaśyo*

sound in this mode of utterance. "Without application of mind" excludes any intentional use of *udātta* etc. This last is not very satisfactory; and, indeed, we should as soon expect the contrary term, *manahprayoga*, 'with application of mind,' to be read, as indicating an utterance in which the mind does its full part, though not the voice also (G. M., in fact, read it in the rule).

## अक्षरव्यञ्जनानामनुपलब्धिर्धनः ॥ ७ ॥

7. "Murmur" is inaudibleness of syllables and consonants.

The commentator explains *akshara*, 'syllables,' as meaning here 'vowels,' but there seems no need of refusing the word its ordinary signification. Inaudibleness, we are further told, being a characteristic of *upāṅgu* also, it is here again specified in order to teach that there is no actual sound heard. Of what follows, a great part has dropped out in B. G. M., and is much corrupted in the other two manuscripts, so as to be very obscure. The separate mention of syllables and consonants is for the sake of clearness (?), and indicates exceeding inaudibleness: and there is added a comparison with tame and wild cattle, of which I fail to make any sense. Others say that the inaudibleness is of *s*, *h*, and so on. All of which is very trivial and unedifying.

## उपलब्धिर्निमदः ॥ ८ ॥

8. "Whisper" is their audibleness.

*manahprayogo yasminn<sup>1</sup> ity amanahprayogam<sup>2</sup>. 'vāca sthānam idṛṣam<sup>3</sup> upāṅgu ity upadiśyate. tatra karaṇavād iti tūṣṇīmabhavanivṛttiyarthani<sup>4</sup>: aśabdām iti śabdasyā<sup>5</sup> 'tyantālpātārtham<sup>6</sup>: amanahprayogam ity udātādīnām sāmīkalpikaprayogapratishedhārtham<sup>7</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. put before *asmin*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -*dah*. <sup>3</sup> W. *manah*; B. -*gah* *stvam*; O. *manasah* *pr-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. O. 'sminn. <sup>5</sup> G. M. -*gah*. <sup>6</sup> W. *sthānam vāca ichvām*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. -*thah*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. -*thah*. <sup>9</sup> G. M. *sāmīkalpakapratī-*; B. G. M. -*thah*.

7. *aksharāṇi svarāḥ: aksharāṇām vyañjanānām<sup>1</sup> cā 'nupalabdhir dhvāno nāma dvitīyaṁ vāca sthānam. upāṅgulakṣhane<sup>2</sup> 'py anupalabdhāu satyām punarvacanam<sup>3</sup> aśabdopalabdhividhānārtham<sup>4</sup>: 'aksharavyañjanānām bhedagrahanam<sup>5</sup> abhikhyārtham<sup>6</sup>: atyantānupalabdhir<sup>7</sup> ity arthaḥ. <sup>8</sup> anye tv<sup>9</sup> āhuḥ: 'aksharavyañjanānām savisarjanāyādīnām<sup>10</sup> anupalabdhir iti.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svaṇānām*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. -*cana*; O. -*cana*. <sup>3</sup> W. B. O. *śabd-*; G. M. -*rthah*. <sup>4</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>5</sup> O. *bhedena* *gr-*. <sup>6</sup> W. *ābhākṣhayayārtham*; O. *ābh-*. <sup>7</sup> O. -*ntāpal-*. <sup>8</sup> W. ins. *yāmanasya paṇor araranyasya pī tacyam iti*; O. ins. *yathā na grāmyasya paṇor ante nāranyasādhyetacyam iti*. <sup>9</sup> O. om. *tu*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *vis-*.

8. *aksharavyañjanānām upalabdhir nimado nāma tṛtīyaṁ vāca sthānam bhavati.*

like the warble of the *calravāka*; the third soma-libation is known as accompanied with loud tone, and this is always to be employed as head-tone, with sound proceeding from the head, and resembling the cries of the peacock, *haṁsa* and *kokila*."

The Rik Pr. (xiii.17) teaches the same three *sthānas*, but calls the third *uttama* instead of *tāra*. The Vāj. Pr. (i.10,30) lays down their number and their place of production (assigning to the third the *bhṛūmadhya*, 'middle of the brows,' instead of *śiras*, 'head'), but gives them no specific names. We cannot well avoid regarding them as involving a difference of pitch, as well as of force or loudness of utterance; the first is low, the third high and shrill, the other intermediate between them, or at the ordinary natural pitch of the voice. They answer to the lower, middle, and upper "registers" of a voice; and our modern musical theory recognizes an analogous distinction of chest-tone and head-tone. Each register, as the following rules go on to explain, is divided into seven tones or pitches.

## मन्द्रादिषु त्रिषु स्थानेषु सप्तसप्त यमाः ॥११॥

11. In the three qualities beginning with "soft," there are seven tones each.

As synonym of *yama*, the commentator gives *svara*, doubtless here to be understood as 'musical note, tone of the gamut;' he adds 'acute, and so on,' which might be said blunderingly, as if the word he had just given meant 'accent' instead of 'musical tone,' or also intelligently, as implying the identity of accent with

*prātaḥ pathen*<sup>10</sup> *nityam urasthitenu*<sup>11</sup>  
*svareṇa śārdūlarutopamenā*<sup>12</sup>;  
*madhyandine kunthagatena cāi* 'va  
*cakrāhvasanīkājitasannibhena*.  
*tāram tu vidyāt savanān*<sup>13</sup> *trīṭyan*<sup>14</sup>  
*śirogatam*<sup>15</sup> *tuc ca sadā*<sup>16</sup> *prayojyam* :  
*mayārahaṁsānyubhrtasvanānām*  
*tulyena nādena śirasthitena*<sup>17</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> B. om. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. put before *vācaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati. kaṇṭhe madhyamam*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati. śirasi tāram*. <sup>5</sup> G. M. ins. *bhavati*. <sup>6</sup> B. *caturvarṇānām*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. ins. *pay-*. <sup>8</sup> W. *-nam up-*; G. M. *-ne urasi prayu-*. <sup>9</sup> B. G. M. om. <sup>10</sup> W. *ka-*; G. M. *-than*. <sup>11</sup> G. M. *-sthālena*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *-rato-*. <sup>13</sup> G. M. *-ne*. <sup>14</sup> G. M. *-ye*. <sup>15</sup> G. M. *-otitātām*. <sup>16</sup> G. M. *tathā*. <sup>17</sup> G. M. *śirogatena*.

11. *trishu mandrādishu sthāreṣu ekāikasmint saptasapta yamā bhavanti* : *yamāḥ* 'svarāḥ' : *udātātādaya* 'iti yāvat. *saptasapte* 'ti *vīpsāyā*<sup>2</sup> *ekāikasminn* 'iti labhyate. *ke te*<sup>3</sup> *yamā ity āṣaṅkyo* 'tara-sūtreṇa'<sup>4</sup> 'ttaram āha.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. *svarādāya*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. *-yāḥ*; O. *-yām*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. *ne*; G. M. O. put before *ke*. <sup>4</sup> W. *-tro*.

ception of *mandra* from that of *atisvārya*; that of the fourth, from *mandra*; and so on through the series. Perhaps the expression is nothing more than one violently figurative, signifying that each tone receives light from, or is set in its true light by, the rest, or the ones or one nearest it: only, in that case, we should look for some word combined with *ḍīpti* to indicate the source of the light.

Müller (under Rik Prāt. xiii.17, r. decii.) surmises that the present rule may mean the same thing with the rule of the Rik Prāt. *anantaraç cā 'tra yamo 'vigeshaç*, which he translates 'in these three places (*sthāna*) a *yama* without another *yama* is undistinguishable.' It is very doubtful, however, whether he is justified in rendering *anantara* by 'not having another,' and whether his rule is not rather intended to signify that the three scales pass directly into one another, the first note of the second being equivalent to an eighth of the first, and so on.

## द्वितीयप्रथमकृष्टास्त्रय आह्वारकस्वराः ॥ १४ ॥

14. "Second," "first," and *krshṭa* are the three tones of the *Āhvārakas*.

This rule makes a *śloka* with the one that follows: which is, of course, a marked indication that both are interpolated here. The same thing may be inferred from the fact that rule 15 teaches nothing which is not found also in 16.

The comment adds nothing whatever to our understanding of the rule.

The *Āhvārakas* are mentioned in the *Caranavyūha* (paragraph 12: see Weber's *Indische Studien*, iii.257) as holders of one *pākhā* of the *Yajur-Veda*.

## मन्द्राद्यो द्वितीयान्ताश्चत्वारस्तैत्तिरीयकाः ॥ १५ ॥

15. The four beginning with *mandra* and ending with "second" are those of the *Tāittirīyas*.

This second half-verse, as already pointed out, is superfluous in view of the next rule, which treats the same subject, and much more explicitly.

14. *dvitīyaç ca prathamāç ca krshṭaç<sup>1</sup> ca te tatho 'ktāḥ<sup>2</sup> : ete traya āhvārakasvarāḥ<sup>3</sup> syuḥ : 'eshānī<sup>4</sup> tūir eva prayogo vedītavyaḥ<sup>5</sup>.* <sup>6</sup>*āhvārakāṇām svarā<sup>6</sup> āhvārakasvarāḥ.*

O. inserts the whole comment out of place, after that to the next rule. <sup>1</sup> G. M. *krush-* (as also, with T., in the rule); O. *kush-*. <sup>2</sup> B. ins. *dvitīyādayaḥ*. <sup>3</sup> W. *-kāv-*; O. *-kārā*. <sup>4</sup> O. om. <sup>5</sup> G. M. *te-*. <sup>6</sup> B. *-kashṭasvarāṇām*; G. M. *-kasvarā*.

15. *mandrādayaç catvāro<sup>1</sup> dvitīyāntāḥ svarā<sup>2</sup> mandracaturtha-  
rtīyadvitīyās tāittirīyakāḥ syuḥ<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. O. *-ra svarā*. <sup>2</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *teshānī tittirīyake prayogo vedītavyaḥ*.



## तामुपदेक्ष्यामः ॥ १८ ॥

18. That progression we will set forth.

The commentator declares *tām* here to bring forward solely the word *vr̥ttim* from the preceding rule (not that word with its qualifications), and the *vr̥tti* aimed at to be the fourfold progression of the *caturyama* taught in rules 16 and 19. This is, of course, forced and unacceptable. I imagine that, on the contrary, in the oral tradition of the *Prāṭicākhya*, an uttered illustration of the four tones, separated by double intervals and so covering the whole octave, was given—which illustration, of course, could not be set down in the written text.

## तच्चतुर्थममित्युक्तम् ॥ १९ ॥

19. That is what is called the quaternion of tones.

This is naturally enough explainable as a winding-up remark, after the exemplification of the four *Tāittirīya* tones notified in the preceding rule has been duly given. To the commentator, it is a mere repetition of what had been already stated above, in rules 15 and 16; and he excuses it as being intended, under the guise of a summing-up, to confirm the view laid down, and repel other opinions inconsistent with it. For, he adds, some people hold the doctrine that there are three *svaras* only, as appears from the half-verse "acute, grave, and circumflex are the three accents." This verse (from the *pāṇinīya* *Çikshā*) was quoted in full above, under rule xxi.1; and W. adds the second half of it here also.

The futility of this exposition, as well as of much that precedes it, will, I think, be obvious to any one. Instead of tracing and pointing out the relation which actually exists between the accents and the *yamas*, and letting us see what musical intervals are re-

18. *yad etad ācāryāṣṭ caturyamam ity uktam tasya caturbheda-bhinnā<sup>1</sup> vr̥ttir<sup>2</sup> nāma: tām upadekshyāma ity ucyate. tām iti tachabdena<sup>3</sup> pūrvoktavrttimātram anukrshyate<sup>4</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -ām. <sup>2</sup> G. M. -im. <sup>3</sup> W. O. *tānimittapabd-*; B. *tām iti labdhena*. <sup>4</sup> W. -kathy-.

19. *ity anena prakāreṇa caturyamam ity<sup>1</sup> uktam. yady api mandrādayo dvitīyāntā (xxiii.15) ity ādisūtradhvajena yamacatusṭhayatvam<sup>2</sup> siddham tathā 'py upasamhāramishena<sup>3</sup> matāntaranivṛttyartham<sup>4</sup> dr̥dhayati. yataḥ kāraṇād evam anye manyante svaratrayamātram:*

*udāttaḥ cā 'rudāttaḥ ca svaritaḥ ca 'svaṛas trayah:.*<sup>5</sup>

*'hrasvo dirghaḥ pluta iti kālato niyamā aci.*<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> O. om. <sup>2</sup> W. *caturyayamacatusṭhayam pra-*; B. *-tayan na*; O. *cat-*. <sup>3</sup> W. *-shena*; G. M. *-hāreṇa mī-*. <sup>4</sup> G. M. *ins. imam artham*. <sup>5</sup> B. O. *-ya iti*; G. M. *trayasvarā iti manyante*. <sup>6</sup> in W. only.



## CHAPTER XXIV.

CONTENTS: 1-4, the four *samhitās* or texts; 5-6, qualifications of a Veda-reader and teacher.

अथ चतस्रः संहिताः ॥ १ ॥

1. Now for the four texts.

A simple heading to the following rules.

पदसंहिताक्षरसंहिता वर्णसंहिताऽङ्गसंहिता चे-  
ति ॥ २ ॥

2. Word-text, syllable-text, letter-text, and member-text, namely.

Here is a very curious and problematical enumeration and designation of *samhitās*. The commentator divides up among them the teachings of the *Prātiśākhya*. To the "word-text" he assigns chapters v.-ix., xi., xii., and xiii. 1-4—that is to say, the great body of rules for the combination of *pada*-text into *samhitā*. To the "syllable-text" he assigns chapter x., which has to do chiefly with such euphonic combinations of vowels as make one syllable out of two. With the "letter-text" are concerned chapters xiii. (i. e. except rules 1-4), xiv., and xvi., mainly occupied with the subjects of duplication and of the occurrence in the *Sanhitā* of *n* and *ñ*, otherwise than as these are results of the rules of euphonic combination. And the "member-text" is said to be taught in chapter

1. *athe 'ty ayam adhikārah: catusrah samhitā<sup>1</sup> ucyanta<sup>2</sup> ity etad adhikṛtaṁ veditavyam ita uttaraṁ yad vakshyāmaḥ<sup>3</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> G. M. ins. *ity*. <sup>2</sup> O. om. <sup>3</sup> O. *-yate*.

2. *padākṣharavarṇāṅgācraḥ<sup>1</sup> catusrah samhitāḥ kramena boddhavyāḥ. pañcamādhyāyam<sup>2</sup> ārabhya<sup>3</sup> "navamād ekādaṣa-dvādaṣā<sup>4</sup> trayodaśasyā<sup>5</sup> "dāu sūtracatusṭayam ca padasamhitā. ḍaṣamo 'ksharasamhitā. trayodaṣacaturdaṣā<sup>6</sup> shodaṣaḥ ca varṇasamhitā. 'vyañjanañ svarāṅgam (xxi.1) ity eśā<sup>7</sup> 'ṅgā-samhitā. etāḥ<sup>8</sup> catusrah samhitāḥ. eteshv anyatra<sup>9</sup> vihitāṁ niśiddham<sup>10</sup> ca kāryaṁ sarvasamhitāsu<sup>11</sup> kuryāt<sup>12</sup>: yatrā<sup>13</sup> "rsha-grahanaḍiko viśeṣho 'sti<sup>14</sup>.*

<sup>1</sup> W. *-gā ayāc*; O. *-gāyāc*. <sup>2</sup> W. B. O. *ārabhya ā nav-*; G. M. *ārabhya ānapa-dāikādaṣ-*; W. O. *-dvādaṣa*. <sup>3</sup> O. *-gā*. <sup>4</sup> W. *-rdaṣa*. <sup>5</sup> B. G. M. *ekaviṃṣo*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. om. <sup>7</sup> O. ins. *ca*. <sup>8</sup> G. M. *nishidhyakāñ*. <sup>9</sup> B. *-tā*; G. M. *sarvatra samh-*; O. *sahit-*. <sup>10</sup> G. M. *syāt*. <sup>11</sup> W. B. O. *atrā*. <sup>12</sup> G. M. *add tatra kuryāt*.

pendent syllables is syllable-text—and so on. And he quotes three passages from the text, by way of illustration: *athā 'bravit* (iii.2.11<sup>3</sup>), *adhishavanam asi* (i.1.5<sup>2</sup>), and *akshnayā vyāghārayati* (v.2.7<sup>5</sup> et al.). Of these, the first is an example of the combination of two separate syllables (vowels) into one syllable, by a rule (2) of the tenth chapter; the second, of the occurrence of *n* after *sh*, by rule xiii.6,7; the third offers (like almost any other pair of words in the *Sanhitā*) cases of the division of consonant-groups, *akshsh-tāna-yā-vyā*-etc. Or, by a different treatment of the successive distinctions, it is said that the combination of two vowels alone is "syllable-text;" that of a vowel and consonant in one word is "letter-text;" that of consonants alone in one word (consonants being "members" or adjuncts of vowels, xxi.1) is "member-text;" anything else than these is "word-text."

It appears from all this that *saṁhitā* is here used nearly in the sense of *saṁdhi*, 'euphonic combination,' and that these four rules have no significance whatever, being a mere bit of outside classification, in which some one has amused himself by indulging.

गुरुत्वं लघुता साम्यः ह्रस्वदीर्घप्लुतानि च ।

लोपागमविकाराश्च प्रकृतिर्विक्रमः क्रमः ॥

स्वरितोदात्तनीचत्वः श्वासो नादो ऽङ्गमेव च ।

एतत्सर्वं तु विज्ञेयं ह्रन्दोभाषामधीयता ॥५॥

5. Heaviness, lightness, evenness; short, long, and protracted quantity; elision, increment, and euphonic alteration; natural state, *vikrama*, *krama*; circumflex, acute, and grave quality; breath, tone, and adjunction—all this must be understood by him who reads the Veda language.

*svarūpam nirūpanīyam. nānāksharasamīyogo 'ksharasamhitā: 'nānāvartnasamīyogo varṇasamhitā: nānāṅgasamīyogo 'ṅgasamhitā. 'krameno 'dāharanāni bhaṇāmah: yathā: athā----: adhi----: akshn----- kevalasvarayoh samīyogo 'ksharasamhitā: 'ekapade svaravyañjanasamīyogo varṇasamhitā: ekapade kevalavyañjanasamīyogo 'ṅgasamhitā: anyatra padasamhitā: ity avāntarabhedo vijñeyah.*

<sup>1</sup> W. B. *svam*. <sup>(2)</sup> G. M. *om.*; O. *om. eva*. <sup>3</sup> O. *-sva*. <sup>(4)</sup> G. M. put also after rule 4 in the text of the *Prāṭicākhya*, as if rules 5 and 6. <sup>(5)</sup> O. *om*. <sup>6</sup> W. *om.*; G. M. *vyāharāmah*. <sup>7</sup> G. M. *om*. <sup>8</sup> B. *om*.

5. *yad gurutvādyaushṭādaḥavidham etat sarvaṁ chandobhāshām vedarūpam<sup>1</sup> vācam adhiyatā paṭhatā vijñeyam. atha vā chandobhāshām<sup>2</sup> vedulakṣaṇam<sup>3</sup> ity arthah. tuṣabdo 'dhyetavya-tiriktanishedhārthah<sup>4</sup>: anena<sup>5</sup> tu sarvathā vijñeyam ity arthah.*

*thunī abhavan* (v.3.6<sup>2</sup>: G. M. omit *na*). Of these, the second is a case under x.13; the third, under x.18: both exhibiting a vowel which irregularly remains *prakṛtyā*, or exempt from alteration. But the particular bearing of the first example on the point of *prakṛti* is more obscure: the phrase is one in which the *samhitā*-reading is (except in respect to accent) the same with the *pada*; and this, probably, is the reason why it is taken. Compare the comment and note to v.2, where this part of the rule now in hand is quoted. For *vikrama* is given the word *vódhavé* (i.6.2<sup>1</sup> et al.), of which the second syllable has the accent called *vikrama*, by xix. 1. *Krama* is again (as under xxiii.20) defined as 'duplication,' and a phrase is quoted containing a case that calls for duplicated utterance, *yad vāi hotā* (iii.2.9<sup>1</sup>: i. e. *yad dvāi*, by xiv.1): 'O. adds another of like character, *yad venoh* (v.1.1<sup>4</sup>). We are permitted to doubt, however, here as at xxiii.20, whether these terms were intended by the maker of the rule in the sense which the commentator assigns to them. The three accents are instanced, in their order as mentioned, by *nyāñcam* (v.5.3<sup>2</sup>), *gām vāvā tārū tāt* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>), and *avadatām* (i.7.2<sup>2</sup>). Reference is made to rule ii.5 as defining "breath," and as example of breath-sounds, or surd consonants, is cited *pūshā te* (i.1.2<sup>2</sup>: B. has instead *pūte*, and W. *pārte*, which occurs at iv.7.13<sup>5</sup>). Rule ii.4, again, is referred to as defining "tone" or sonant utterance, and the example is *bhāgudhe bhāgudhā* (ii.5.6<sup>6</sup>). Finally, *aṅgam*, which I have rendered 'adjunction,' is interpreted as alluding to the subject of syllabication (xix.1 etc.), and a phrase is quoted, *tam matsyah prā'bravīt* (ii.6.6<sup>1</sup>), which we are to divide *tam-mat-syah-prāb-bra-vīt*.

The verses composing this rule are found in a passage prefixed to the proper text of the Rik Prāt. (see Müller's edition, p. viii.).

पदक्रमविशेषज्ञो वर्णक्रमविचक्षणः ।

स्वरमात्राविभागज्ञो गृहेदाचार्यसंस्तदं

गृहेदाचार्यसंस्तदमिति ॥ ६ ॥

6. He who understands the distinctions of the *pada-krama*, who is versed in the *varṇa-krama*, and knows the divisions of accent and quantity, may go and sit with the teachers.

*ukto nādo yathā: bhāg-..... vyañjanañ svarāṅgam* (xxi. 1) *ity uktam aṅgam yathā: tam-..... vijñeyatvam*<sup>17</sup> *iti*<sup>18</sup> *nitya-vidhiḥ: vipakṣhe bādhit: mantrō hīnaḥ svarato varṇato ve*<sup>19</sup> *tyādī*<sup>20</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> G. M. -*dasvar*-. <sup>2</sup> O. -*shā*. <sup>3</sup> W. O. -*nāt*; G. M. -*nām*. <sup>4</sup> W. -*kta iti nish*-.  
<sup>5</sup> G. M. *anenu dhryatā*. <sup>6</sup> G. M. *sthānakāt*-. <sup>7</sup> B. O. *sthūlyam*; G. M. *tī samyam*.  
<sup>8</sup> G. M. O. om. <sup>9</sup> W. ins. *etat sarvaṁ tu vijñeyam chañdobhāvādhyatī*. <sup>10</sup> B. om.  
<sup>11</sup> G. M. ins. *tad*. <sup>12</sup> in O. only. <sup>13</sup> W. *palakr*-. <sup>14</sup> O. *tad yathā*. <sup>15</sup> O. om. <sup>16</sup> MSS. -*tañ*. <sup>17</sup> W. om. <sup>18</sup> G. M. O. -*yam*. <sup>19</sup> G. M. *ita*. <sup>20</sup> O. *vī*. W. -*dinā*; B. -*dinā nāma*; O. *mīthyā prayukto na tam artham āha tyādinām*.

of obtaining good things; hence, by application to the reading of the Veda one attains the highest *brahma*. To that let him who is wise especially devote himself; that let him deliver over to pupils; by application to that and communication of it what is there that one does not attain?" From Yājñavalkya: "Above all sacrifices, and ascetic practices, and pure works, the Veda is the highest means of felicity to the twice-born ones. The Brahman who, not reading the Vedas, expends his labor in other directions—he quickly falls, while living, into the condition of a *Ādṛa*, and his posterity with him" (the latter of these two verses, which is not given by W. B., is found in Manu, at ii.168). From the Mahābhārata: "Whoever shall repeat to pupils the religious, sacred Sarasvatī, he shall gain a reward equal to that from the giving of land and kine." From the Vishnudharmottara-purāṇa: "By imparting the Veda, a man attains all the fruits of sacrifices; by imparting an *upaveda*, he shares in the bliss of the Gandharvas." From the Brahmapurāṇa: "That reward cannot be told in a thousand æons, which, oh sage! one obtains by even a very little teaching of the Veda." And from the Bhaviṣyat-purāṇa: "The sonless obtains sons; the poor becomes rich; but he who is ever devoted to the study of the Veda is dissolved in the highest *brahma*."

Next we are told the characteristic form of the Veda: "The Yajur-Veda is brown-eyed, slim-waisted, big-throated, big-cheeked, black-footed, dusky, born of the family of Kaśyapa." If there is (as may be the case) real meaning hidden under these apparently senseless epithets, it escapes my discovery

*tathā ca yājñavalkyaḥ :*

*yajñānām tapasām cāi 'va śubhānām'<sup>33</sup> cāi 'va kurmanām :  
veda eva dvijātīnām niḥcreyasakarah parah.*

*'yo 'nadhītya'<sup>34</sup> dvijo vedān anyatra kurute gramam :  
sa jīvan eva gādratvam ācū gachati sāvayajāḥ<sup>35</sup>.*

*mahābhārata'<sup>36</sup>:*

*yo brūyāt cā 'pi śiṣhyebhyo'<sup>37</sup> dharmyām brāhmīn sarasvatīm :  
prthivīgopradānābhyām sa tulyaphalam ānute.*

*vishnudharmottare 'pi'<sup>38</sup>:*

*vedadānād avāpnōti sarvaṁ yajñaphalam narah :  
upavedapradānena gandharvāḥ saha modate.*

*brahmapurāṇe 'pi'<sup>39</sup>:*

*na tat'<sup>40</sup> kalpasahasrena gādītūn'<sup>41</sup> śakyate phalam :  
yad vedadānād āpnōti'<sup>42</sup> svalpād'<sup>43</sup> api mahāmata.*

*bhaviṣyatpurāṇe 'pi'<sup>44</sup>:*

*aputro labhate putrān adhanō dhanavān bhavet :  
sādādhyanayuktas tu '<sup>45</sup>pare brahmaṇi'<sup>46</sup> līyate.*

*vedasvarūpam ucyate :*

*yajurvedaḥ piṅgalākṣaḥ kṛṣṇamādhyaḥ bṛhadgalaḥ :  
bṛhatkapolāḥ kṛṣṇānṅghriḥ<sup>47</sup> tāmraḥ kaśyapagotrājaḥ<sup>48</sup>.*

Sanhitā (I should guess that they would all prove to occur in the Brāhmaṇa or Âranyaka), and that the first class are offered as containing cases of combination at variance with the rules of the Prātiçākhyā, while in the second class these rules are observed throughout. Thus, in the first example, vii.4 would require *naksh-* after *pra*; in the second, v.12 would require *im 'amāda*; in the third, the *s* of *sapta* should be *sh* by vi.2; in the fourth, the *i* of *mīthunī* should remain unchanged by x.18; in the fifth, *asmin* is not included among the words which by vi.14 have an increment of *s* before *i*. In the other class, on the contrary, *agnishptomasya* follows vi.2, *nish pra* is by viii.24 and 35 (see the comment to viii. 35, where the passage is quoted as illustration), and *uçmasī* by iii. 13; the first example has nothing but cases under the general laws of euphony. I conjecture, then, that the *na* in the second line of the introductory verse is to be amended to *ca*; and that we are instructed that the rules of the treatise are followed, outside the Sanhitā proper, only according to the nature of each particular case, or even by arbitrary choice. If there is any definite system according to which the phonetic peculiarities of the Sanhitā are observed or neglected in putting together the endings of sections and other divisions, I, at any rate, have not been at the pains to study it out, and the work belongs rather to an editor of the Sanhitā than to an editor of the Prātiçākhyā: it seems somewhat strange to find the prolonged *i* of *uçmasī* retained in the ending, while the uncombinable character of the final of *mīthunī* is neglected.

There can be little question that the passage here treated is an appendage to the proper text of the Tribhāshyaratna, which, with the Prātiçākhyā, takes in general (the only exception is at viii.35) no account of the subdivisions of *anuvākas*.

By way of conclusion, the remark is added that the repetition of the final words of the rule indicates the end of the treatise. This is not to be approved, for the repetition is simply that which is made at the end of every chapter, and so shows nothing more than the conclusion of the chapter.

(28) W. *yasasah ph-*; G. M. *çreyasān param*; O. *çreyasah param*. 29 G. M. O. *tato*.  
30 G. M. *-dhyāyāmiratāt*. (31) W. B. om. (32) O. *tat ki yajñā*. 33 O. *çucindān*. (34) W. B. om. 35 O. *nadhīva*. 36 G. M. O. *-te 'pi*. 37 G. M. *çishyāya*. 38 G. M. O. om.  
39 G. M. O. om. 40 W. O. *tūya*. 41 O. *gani-*. 42 W. B. *avāp-*. 43 W. O. *svātmāda*.  
44 G. M. O. om. (45) O. *parabrahmanī*. 46 W. *-nādhrih*; O. *-shānādhri*. 47 G. M. *lāç-*. 48 W. *-dānsi*. 49 W. *-dhāh*. 50 O. *-prad-*. 51 G. M. *nā*. 52 W. B. O. *-rkaç*.  
53 W. *-dhāh*. (54) B. *sāngopāṅgavedasvalakṣaṇam*, and put below, under *-varane*; G. M. O. substitute *evan sāngopāṅgam vedam qotrasavarīpādījñānena* (G. M. *-di vijñānam*) *adhīyānah pūto bhavati*. [yadrchayā:

*granthāntare yathātattvam* (O. *yathā tadvad*) *idam çastram* (G. M. ins. *yathāvidhi*) *asūtrīteshu* (O. *sūcakeshu*) *sthāneshu pāturusheshu nā* (O. om.) *varatate*.  
*tathā hi: pra-----: sa-----: mahi-----: api-----: asmiñs-----: ityāddu na* (O. om. *na*) *varatate* (G. *prav-*): *siñhe-----: dvād-----: dim-----: uçmasi-----: ityāddu tu varatate*. *gachēd acāryasamsadam iti vipsā çāstrasamāptim* (O. *-trapari-sam-*) *dyotayati*. 55 B. *-ñçatimo*; G. M. O. *dvitīyapraçne dvādaça*.

mint sahasraśākhē, ūrdhve castrē pratissthite, brahmasāme pratissthite, agnidhṛte, and prathamaje; under iv.12, paṇḍrapanī (or bhasmaprapanī); under iv.15, tanī (or tām) āhurī hvayante (or vācayati), hātī punar (or manur) juhōti, and hutī tasmād vivāh (or evāh); under iv.37, indrāgnī havāmahe; under vi.5, pramatis te devānām; under xi.3, as beginning of an anuvāka, dhātā devebhyo 'surān; under xi.16, gayasphāno 'gnishu. All this, in my view, is false and arbitrary interpretation; the Prātiṣākhya is less careful to limit itself to the *minimum citabile* than the commentator would fain have it, and it quotes, for example, the whole word *viśākhē* instead of *-śākhē* alone, simply because *śākhē* occurs as *pragraha* only in that word.\* The same implication is appealed to by the commentator under xi.9,15, xii.3, xvi.12 (though without actual citation of phrases), to explain away what would otherwise be inaccuracies in the Prātiṣākhya; *nalām plavam* is given under xiii.16, in the course of the unjustifiable exposition of that rule; and *brahmāṣṇ*, though found in the Sanhitā, is credited under xv.8 to another *śākhā*. I do not regard anything in this whole class of cases as authorizing us to suppose that the Prātiṣākhya had in view a text including anything not found in the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā.

Next, as to citations made in the commentary as if from the text to which the Prātiṣākhya relates, but not found in the Sanhitā. And here I have first to report a few phrases which are among those occurring only in the manuscripts that came last to my hands, and which escaped my notice when preparing for my last search through the Sanhitā, so that I have not looked for them (not having had the courage to undertake the long and tedious quest through the Sanhitā a fourth time for so little). They are *achā-vākah* (xiv.5), *uccā ratnam ayajanta* (ii.49), *tasmād varāpam* (xx.3), *dārṣṇyāṇ hi* (xxi.16), *naś cid ati* (xiv.10), *prācṇāti* (xiv.9), and *bṛhaspati sūrapatē* (xiv.10). Respecting several of these, it is doubtful whether they are not mere corruptions of phrases actually found and referred. Then there is *kaviṣastah* (xvi.2), instead of which, by an error, I sought and found *kaviḡastāh*. There remain, of quotations hunted for but not discovered, the following: *adya vasu vasutī 'tī 'ndram eva* (x.10: O. only), *anv enam mātā* (xx.1: Weber refers me for this to Çāṅkh. vi.17.2 [?]; Ācval. iii.3; also Āit. Brāh. ii.6), *ahorātre pārṣve* (viii.7: only W. and [?]; O.: found in Tāitt. Ār. iii.13.2), *uta gravaśa prthivīm mitrasya* (v.12: only G. M.), *upārchaty askandāya* (x.9: only G. M.), *catuṛhotā* (ii.25: Tāitt. Br. ii.2.3<sup>+</sup>), *brahmāudanam pacati* (x.7: Tāitt. Br. i.1.9<sup>3</sup>), *yaś chandasām* (xiv.10: O. only), *yā praci dik* (iv.33: W. B. O.), *varshābhyah* (xiv.16: but I am not certain that I did not satisfy myself with *varshyābhyah* and omit to search for this), *varshyebhih* (xiv.16: O. only, and it reads *varshebhih*),

\* The quotation of *dhātā rātiḥ* (xi.3), to be sure, is more out of the way, and only to be explained as irregularly pleonastic, like that of *iyam eva sā yā* (xi.3), into which the commentator, with equal arbitrariness, tries to interpret a very different meaning.

I would repeat here, what I have already said, that my testing of the precise adaptation of the Prātiçākhyā to the Sanhitā is not absolute, since I possess neither an *index verborum* to the latter nor a *pada*-manuscript, and my results will probably admit of rectification in some points—but I trust not to any such extent as should invalidate the general conclusion.

This conclusion is, that the Prātiçākhyā probably contemplates the same text, neither more nor less, as that which constitutes the Tāittirīya-Sanhitā, the only *çākhā* left us (unless the Kāthaka be regarded as another) of the many which formerly represented the Black Yajur-Veda. The name Tāittirīya-Prātiçākhyā, then, is both a convenient and a suitable one to be applied to the treatise.

If, however, this name be understood as implying that the text-book emanates directly from the Tāittirīya school, its propriety is much more questionable. Besides the numerous teachers and "holders of *çākhās*" referred to in the rules, whose names in some cases are related with those of traditional schools of the Black Yajus (see Weber's notes to the Caranavyūha, in his Indische Studien, iii.256 ff.), three schools are mentioned by name, those of the Mīmāṃsakas (v.41), Āhvārakas (xxiii.14), and Tāittirīyas (xxiii.15, 16). Now we do not expect the text-book of a school to name that school; its rules are those which apply "here," "with us," and only outsiders need specification; besides, the Tāittirīyas are represented as holding a doctrine which is not that of the treatise itself, although it is deemed of consequence enough to be set forth with a detail elsewhere unknown. We are far from fully comprehending as yet the origin, nature, and relations of the "schools" of Vedic study and their accepted texts or *çākhās*, or the causes which have preserved to us so few of the latter, and of the school-treatises or *prātiçākhyās*; but we must of course assume that there were various degrees of difference among the *çākhās*, and that some were, only infinitesimally unlike some others. And it is perhaps possible to point out certain minor points, in which the orthoepical form of the Tāittirīya-text as recorded differs from that to be inferred from the Prātiçākhyā.

Among these points we are not allowed to reckon the retention of *h* before surd gutturals and labials and before sibilants (against ix.2), nor of *n* before palatals (against v.24) and *l* (against v.25), nor the omission of *t* (required by v.33) between *t* and *s*, nor of the various duplications and insertions and aspirations taught in chapter xiv., since these are matters on which we are to expect discordance between theory and practice. Nor would it be safe to make anything of the consistent and emphatic acceptance in the Sanhitā of *anusvāra* as an alphabetic element, while the Prātiçākhyā wavers (see under ii.30) between regarding it as such and as a mere affection of the preceding vowel. Of more consequence is the division of the sections or *anuvākas* in the recorded text into fifties of words, or *kandikās*, which causes the disappearance of more than one specialty of reading expressly prescribed in the treatise (e. g., of the *i* of *uçmasi*, at the end of i.3.6<sup>1</sup>: see under iii.

found (under xx.8) for questioning whether in the *pada*-text belonging to the makers of the Prātiśākhya the peculiar rule followed by the known Tāittirīya *pada*-text as to the accentuation of its separable words was of force. The latter text is of a very peculiar, not to say an anomalous, character in many respects; in these it is supported by the Prātiśākhya, so far as the latter goes (I will instance as examples only the treatment of *yojā* and *evā*, and other cases noticed under iii.15, of *nīcāḍ*, v.8, and of *ekāikayā*, v.19): whether it does not contain other peculiarities which are ignored by the Prātiśākhya, and which consequently prove it not to be the one which this presupposes, I cannot say; but, from an item or two of information received from Prof. Weber, I imagine that it does so. The question will, at any rate, be cleared up by the discussion of the Tāittirīya *pada*-text which Weber, as I rejoice to learn, intends to add to his transliterated edition of the *Sanhitā*, now going through the press.

I attribute it only to a (very unusual) awkwardness of statement on the part of the Prātiśākhya, that it appears to leave a part of the words ending in an original *o* out of the category of *pragrahas* (see under iv.7), and so to deny them the right to be followed by *iti*, as they are in fact followed in the known *pada*-text.

The *krama*-text ("word-*krama*") appears to be mentioned in rules xxiii.20 and xxiv.5, and more unequivocally in xxiv.6 (all of them, however, of suspicious authenticity as original parts of the Prātiśākhya: see below); but it is only three times quoted in the comment (under vii.2, ix.17,20), and so makes but a small figure there as compared with the *jatā*. Examples from the latter are given under iii.1, v.33, viii.8,12,16,35, ix.22, x.9,10,13, xi.9,16,17, xii.7, xx.2, and sometimes in considerable number and at great length; and once (under xx.2), where the commentator has occasion to mention the various kinds of text, he specifies *saṁhitā*, *pada*, and *jatā*, ignoring the *krama* altogether. This seems strange, inasmuch as the *jatā* is regarded\* as a secondary form of *krama*, and founded upon it; but the simple explanation appears to be that the *krama* brings up no questions of *sandhi* which do not arise also in *saṁhitā* and *pada*, and so needs no special attention where only methods of *sandhi* are taught; while the inversions of the *jatā* bring new elements into contact, and so create new cases of combination which require to be settled. If we may trust the commentator's interpretation, rules viii.12,35 are given expressly for cases that arise only in *jatā*-text; under viii.16, he commits an obviously false explanation in order to reach a *jatā*-case; under v.33, he makes a *sandhi* which the Prātiśākhya certainly never intended, because it is required by the letter of the rule, in a case which the makers of the treatise had apparently overlooked; under xi.16,17, the *jatā* is resorted to, apparently with reason, for counter-examples to justify the form of statement adopted in the rule. The weight of evidence, upon the whole, is decidedly in favor of

---

\* See Dr. Thibaut's "Jatāpatala," Leipzig, 1870.



The nature of the tone of a circumflexed syllable, i.46-7; with this is combined an uncertainty of view of the Prāṭiśākhya itself, expressed in rules 44-5; there is nothing else like it in the treatise; perhaps we may best assume that rules 44-7 are a later intrusion. The mode of production of *anusvāra* and *svarabhakti*, ii.19. The quality of the *a*-element in *āi* and *āu*, ii.27. The phonetic character of *h* and *ḥ*, ii.47-8. The nature of the combination of *e* or *o* with (elided) *u*, xi.19. The occurrence of lingual *l*, xiii.16: this the comment vainly endeavors to make out an accepted doctrine of the Prāṭiśākhya. A denial of the enclitic circumflex, xiv.32-3. Nasalization of final vowels, xv.6-8: the comment treats rule 8 as the direct teaching of the text-book. Accent of protracted vowels (?), xv.9. Correction of the final theme-vowel of neuters in *as*, *is*, *us* in the nom. pl. before *ñ*, xvi.16. Utterance of *āi* final in a single case, xvi.24. Degrees of nasalization, xvii.1-5. Utterance of accents and alphabetic sounds generally, xvii.6-8. *Kampa* between two circumflex syllables, xix.3-5. Use of the term *yama* for the nasal counterparts, xxi.13. Utterance of the syllable *om*, xviii.1-7. *Yama*-tones held by certain schools, xxiii.14-19.

## II. Matters of *sandhi* or euphonic combination.

1. The most important cases in this division are two or three in which the views of different authorities are reported without any clear expression by the treatise of the opinion held, or the rule to be followed, by its school. Thus, with regard to the combination of a final mute with an initial *h*, v.38-41; where, indeed, the view first stated, as that of certain specified teachers, is doubtless to be regarded as that of the Prāṭiśākhya, notwithstanding the equivocal way in which it is put forward. Again, at ix.1, the dropping of final *h* before a sibilant followed by a surd mute must probably in like manner, though referred to the authority of a single teacher, be taken as a binding rule. And it is hard to believe that rule x.19, prescribing the invariable omission of final *v*, was not meant to be modified by x.21. That the treatment of *anusvāra* as a distinct consonantal element is put by xv.2-3 upon certain dissidents, must not be looked at by itself alone; it stands connected with the general equivocal attitude assumed by the Prāṭiśākhya with reference to this vexed question in phonetics (see note to ii.30). Once more, the mode of duplication in groups beginning with *l* as reported in xiv.2-3, with reference to the authorities who teach it, seems to be acknowledged by a later rule (xiv.7) as binding: this interpretation, however, is not free from doubt.

2. In all other cases, the Prāṭiśākhya is liberal enough to record the opinions of respected authorities upon points as to which its own teachings are distinctly opposed to theirs. Thus, as to the treatment of *m* before *y* and *v*, v.30 and xiii.3 (the repeated mention of this shows it to be regarded as a view entitled to the most respectful consideration); the combination of *p* with *ç* and of *n* with *ç* before a consonant, v.36-7; the *sandhi* of *eṣṭar* with *rāyaḥ*, viii.19-22; the treatment of *h* before an initial consonant, ix.4-6; the utterance or omission of final *y* and *v*, x.20-23; the insertion

matter in the Sanhitā by position and surroundings merely. There are but two cases of its departure from this method: namely, its use of *alopa* at xiii.15, and of *samkhyāsu* at xvi.25; and in neither one is its success precisely of a character to make us wish it had gone farther in the same direction. This peculiarity renders impossible any profitable comparison of its phraseology with that of other grammatical works.

The general character of the Prāṭicākhya is that of an earnest, sensible, consistent treatise, thoroughly worked out and dealing with its proper task with completeness and accuracy, and confining itself quite strictly to that task. There is no labored feebleness and artificial obscurity, as in parts of the Vājasaneyi-Prāṭicākhya, nor any inclusion of matters pertaining to general grammar, as in the Atharva-Prāṭicākhya. It has its minor inaccuracies and inconsistencies, its obscurities of *anuvrtti* inseparable from the *sūtra*-style, and its rules that seem to defy interpretation: but these are inconspicuous blemishes; no one of the other works of its class is more thoroughly respectable throughout.

Turning, now, to the more special consideration of the commentary, we have to note, as the most important point, a break of continuity between it and the Prāṭicākhya. The commentator is not the recipient of a certain tradition, that gives him surely and precisely the import of the rules which he has to expound; the text-book has come down to him as something authoritative and sacred, indeed, yet in some points obscure, so that he is in doubt as to what it means; in others imperfect, so that it needs emendation; in others not in accordance with the views held by him and his school respecting the text, so that these have to be interpreted into it.

Thus, in the first place, the instances are frequent in which, to his own interpretation of a rule, he adds a different view held by other interpreters: either without naming them (as under i.19,21, xiii.16, xiv.5,11, xvii.5, xxiii.7), or referring to one of his special sources and predecessors (as under ii.19,33), or setting off against one another the views of two of these, Vararuci and Māhisheya (as under ii.14, iv.40, viii.19,20,22, xviii.7). In a large proportion of the instances, it is true, the difference of opinion is upon some utterly trivial point, turning on the interpretation of a *tu* or the like, and only illustrating the hair-splitting tendencies of the native exegetes; but in some cases it is of more consequence, and once goes so far as to question (under viii.20) whether an authority referred to is Uttamottariya or Dvāvuttamottariya. Again, where a rule is really obscure, the commentator has sometimes, palpably, nothing more than guesses to give at its meaning, and ventures two or three of them (as under ii.2, xiv.22, xv.9, xix.5, xxiii.17), among which it would be hard to choose the least acceptable; or, if he gives but one (as under xi.19, xviii.4, xxiii.18,19), it is no less unsatisfactory. There are yet other cases in which what seems to be the evident meaning of a rule is misapprehended and distorted,

in the settlement of difficult or controverted points (for the details, see index). Vararuci is a name very common in grammatical literature; to identify our commentator with any other of the various individuals who have worn it would doubtless be daring in the extreme. Nor does Ātreya, probably, stand in any definable relation to the grammarian of that name who is (see p. 430) twice quoted in the Prātiçākhyā itself. From Pāṇini, rules are directly quoted under ii.12, iii.9, v.1, xiii.16, xiv.4, xxiv.3; and the *pāṇinīyāh* or the *vyākaraṇa* are farther referred to under i.15, 53, 57, ii.47, xviii.1. Pāṇinian terms are, further, *nañ*, i.60, x.22, *nic*, ii.17, *hal*, ix.24, *yar*, xiv.4, and *lyap*, xxi.14. The Mahābhāshya is professedly quoted under ii.7, v.2; but the passage given is actually from Kāiyyata's gloss. A definition is taken from the Amarakoṣa under i.1. Kāuhaleya is quoted under xix.4, xxiii.17; and the Kālanirṇaya under xviii.1. The Brāhmaṇa of the Vājasaneyins is referred to under xiv.33, and extracts from the Mahābhārata and various Purāṇas are set forth under xxiv.6.

But the authority most often appealed to is the "Çikshā," by which the commentator intends a very different work from the *pāṇinīya-Çikshā*, and one much more comprehensive. He takes extracts from it, of a verse, or part of a verse, or more than one verse, under i.1 (three times), ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3, xx.12, xxi.1, 15, xxii.13, xxiii.10, 17. Among these extracts are (under i.1, ii.2, xxi.1, xxiii.10) several passages which are found also in the *pāṇinīya-Çikshā*; and among the metrical extracts which are now and then given without specifying their source (under xiv.23, 26, 28, xix.3, xxi.1, 6, 15, xxiii.17, 19, xxiv.6) are likewise one or two (under xxiii.17, 19) which occur in the same treatise. That the commentator is inclined to regard his Çikshā as of higher authority than the Prātiçākhyā itself was pointed out under xx.12; that it was a work specially appertaining to the Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā may be inferred with probability from the words which it cites (under xxi.15) in illustration of the varieties of *svarabhakti*.

rants, ii.44,45; of *h*, ii.6,9,46,47; of *visarjaniya*, ii.46,48; of *anusvāra*, ii.19, 30; of *nāsikyas* (*yamas* etc.), ii.49-51; of *svarabhakti*, ii.19.

3. *Quantity* :

quantity of short and long vowels, i.31-3,35; of protracted vowels, i.36; of consonants, i.37; of *anusvāra* (or nasalized vowel), i.34, xvii.5; of syllables ("heavy" and "light"), xxii.14,15; of pauses and hiatus, xxii.13; of *om*, xviii.1.

4. *Accent* :

general character of accents: acute, i.38, xxii.9; grave, i.39, xxii.10; circumflex, i.40-47, xvii.6.—varieties of independent circumflex: *nitya* or original, xx.2; its quality, xx.9: *kshāipra*, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its quality, xx.9: *abhinīhata*, xx.4; its occurrence, xii.9; its quality, xx.10: *praṣṭishṭa*, xx.5; its occurrence, x.17; its quality, xx.11.—enclitic circumflex: its occurrence, xiv.29-33; its varieties: *prātihata*, xx.3; its quality, xx.11: *pādavṛtta*, xx.6; its quality, xx.12: *tāirovyañjana*, xx.7; its quality, xx.12.—*pracaya* accent, xxi.10,11.—*vikrama*, xix.1,2; its quality, xvii.6.—*kampa*, between two circumflexes, xix.3-5.—accent resulting from combination of two syllables into one, x.10,12,16,17, xii.9-11.—accent of *om*, xviii.2,3,5-7.—accent of protracted vowel (?), xv.9.

5. *Syllabication* :

division of syllables, xxi.1-9.

6. *Mode and tones of utterance* :

general mode of utterance, xxiii.20; the three *sthānas* or qualities, xxii.11; the seven do., xxiii.4-10; the twenty-one *yamas* or tones, xxii.12, xxiii.11-19.—tone of *om*, xviii.4.

III. SANDHI OR EUPHONIC COMBINATION:

introductory, v.1-3; four kinds of combination, xxiv.1-4.

1. *Final vowels* :

final vowels not liable to combination, *pragrahas*, iv.1-54, x.24; special cases of uncombinable finals, x.13,18; protracted finals, x.24; their nasalization, xv.7,8.—nasalization of final vowels, xv.6.—the particle *u*, ix.16,17.—lengthening of final *a*, iii.2-6,8-12; of final *i* and *u*, iii.7,13,14.

combination of simple final vowels: with similar initial, x.2; of final *a* with initial vowels, x.4-9; exceptions, x.13; lost in certain cases before *e* or *o*, x.14; *i*, *u*, final, x.15, ix.17; exceptions, ix.16, x.18.—combination of final diphthongs, ix.11,12,14,15; *e* and *o* with initial *a* (see also Initial vowels), ix.13; treatment of the resulting *y* and *v*, x.19-23; after their loss, no further combination, x.25.

accent resulting from combinations of final vowels, x.10,12,16,17, xx.1,5,9,11; resulting nasalization, x.11.

2. *Initial vowels* :

initial vowel lengthened, iii.15.—loss of *a* after final *e* or *o*, ix.13, xi.1; detail of cases of loss and exceptions, xi.2-19, xii.1-8; resulting accent, xii.9-11, xx.4,10 — *r* to *ar* in special case, v.9.

## INDEX OF CITATIONS

MADE IN THE COMMENTARY, FROM THE TĀITTIRĪYA-SANHITĀ.

THIS INDEX contains the references reported above in the body of the work, as made by the commentator to the fundamental text. If, however, a cited word or passage is reported as occurring more than once in the text, reference is given only to the first occurrence. It has been found impracticable to carry out any scheme of distinction of the value of the citations; and any one using the Index will have to turn back to the notes in order to determine whether a given passage is quoted merely as an example of some general class, or as one that was more or less probably had directly in view, as example or counter-example, by the makers of the treatise; whether it is a unique phrase, or one more than once repeated, or even a word of frequent occurrence—and so on.

TS. i.	TS. i.	TS. i.
1.1 i.21,33, ii.22, iii.1,3, ix.1, x.5,10,19, xiv.21, xvii.7, xviii.1,7, xx.3, xxi.7, xxi.13.	2.12 i. xi.11,17; i. xvi.27.	4.14 ii.44, ix.4.
2 i. xiii.2, xv.1, xxi.15; i. x.2, xxiv.5.	13 i. iii.2, iv.34; i. iii.7, iv.15,22,33, xvi.2; i. iv.46, xi.17.	16 xvi.13.
3 iv.6, viii.8, xvi.27.	14 i. iii.8, ix.20,23, xii.7, xvi.15,27; i. i.48, ii.47, iv.28, v.8, vi.5, viii.24, x.16, xii.15, xiv.6, xvi.13; i. i.56, v.15; i. v.17, vii.10, xvi.14; i. xiv.10, xvi.13; i. viii.8; i. i. iii.8; i. vii.11, xi.4, xvi.2; i. vi.2, viii.24, xvi.25.	18 iv.41, xi.16.
4 i. viii.8.	3.1 i. i.61.	19 vi.7, ix.20.
5 i. iv.44, ix.22, x.25, xi.16; i. vi.11, xiii.7, xxiv.4.	2 i. vii.11; i. iv.12, vii.11, xiv.28.	20 xv.1, xvii.4.
7 i. x.10.	3 i. i.51,60, iii.1, vii.6 ter.	22 iii.12, iv.4,12, xvi.13,29.
8 vi.5, x.2,6, xi.8,16, xiv.1.	4 i. viii.26; xi.13,16.	24 vi.5, xi.13.
9 i. vi.10, vii.14; i. iii.15, v.2,21, x.13 bis, xi.16, xiv.12,18.	5 i. xiv.26.	25 xiii.9.
10 i. vi.5, vii.14, xiv.10, xvi.2,27; i. v.3, vi.4, xi.16; i. ii.43, vii.18, ix.2, xvi.14.	6 i. iv.42; i. i. iii.13; i. i.33, x.10; end'g xxiv.6.	26 iv.42.
11 i. xiii.6.	7 i. iii.8, iv.11,47, viii.16; i. viii.9, xi.16.	27 vi.7, viii.27.
12 iii.3, v.5, viii.8, xi.17, xiv.19.	8 i. iii.8; i. iii.2, ix.22.	30 iv.11.
13 i. ii.20, ix.22 bis; i. xiii.10 bis, xvi.26; i. iv.12, ix.9, xii.8, xxi.12.	9 i. i.37, v.38 bis, viii.2, xiv.12,20 bis, xxi.3.	33 i.55, iii.14, vi.5, xi.3.
14 i. i.61, iii.8,9,10; i. viii.23, xi.3, xii.7; i. i.61, xi.3,9, xiii.16; i. iii.12, v.17, vi.5 bis, vii.5,10, ix.22, x.10,25, xiii.3.	10 i. xi.17; i. xiii.14, xvi.23.	36 viii.32.
2.1 i. ix.10, x.19,22,25, xi.8, xviii.7; i. x.18.	11 xi.17.	41 ii.49, xiv.24.
2 i. iv.47, xiv.9; i. i. iv.42; i. xxi.3; i. vi.12, x.2,17.	12 ix.21, xi.18.	42 vii.16, ix.20.
3 i. xi.13 bis; i. iii.5, xi.8.	13 i. v.13; i. iv.20, viii.9.	43 i. i.61, xi.9; i. xvi.26.
4 i. xi.3, xxi.3; i. x.1.	14 i. i.61, iii.12, ix.23, xiv.23, xvi.17, xx.12; i. iii.10; i. v.12; i. x.15, xii.7; i. i.61; i. vii.9, viii.28,34, xii.5; i. iii.5; i. iv.6, xvi.14; i. viii.31, ix.22.	44 i. vii.2, xi.3, xii.5,7, xiii.4, xxi.5; i. viii.3, ix.22, xii.7; xvi.13 bis.
5 i. xiv.29; xxi.1,7.	4.1 i. iii.5, ix.20, xiii.15; i. iv.32, vi.13.	45 i. iii.2, vi.5; i. viii.24, xiii.12, xxi.4; i. ix.21, xi.7, xv.4.
6 xi.10,17, xiii.10, xvi.29, xxi.6.	2 viii.27.	46 i. xii.8, xiv.30,31, xx.3; i. xiii.15.
7 iii.5, iv.9 bis, xiv.28.	3 viii.10.	5.1 i. v.28,30, xiv.23, xvii.2; i. ix.19, x.10,13; i. v.28,30, xx.7.
8 i. ix.21,22, x.10, xi.16,17; i. i.56, v.10.	4 xi.10.	2 i. ix.20, xiv.23; i. iv.16; i. iv.15; i. x.10.
9 iii.2, viii.27,28.	9 v.27, xxi.12.	3 i. ii.48; i. xiv.18; i. iii.8, ix.22.
10 i. iii.3, ix.21; i. iv.52.	10 iv.42, vi.4.	4 i. xx.8; i. v.28,31, xiv.28.
11 i. viii.8,18-23,29, x.14, xvi.29; i. xi.16.	11 xi.16, xvi.25.	5 i. i.33, xi.3 bis, xiv.9,19,27; i. xxii.13; i. iii.4.
	13 xi.17.	6 i. x.10, xiv.23; i. iii.8, viii.8; i. iii.8, xi.13; i. iii.5, v.32, xiv.5,12,13, xxi.5.

## TS. ii.

6.12 <sup>1</sup>ii.49, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup>iii.12, xiv.5, 23; <sup>3</sup>ix.21, xi.4; <sup>4</sup>i.21, iii.9, xi.4; <sup>5</sup>xiv.5; <sup>6</sup>xii.7, xv.4, xvi.2.

## TS. iii.

1.1 <sup>1</sup>v.15.  
2 <sup>1</sup>v.15.  
3 <sup>1</sup>i.59, iv.52.  
4 <sup>1</sup>ix.21, xi.10, xvi.29; <sup>2</sup>iv.28; <sup>3</sup>ix.22 *bis*; <sup>4</sup>x.14; <sup>5</sup>vi.14.  
6 <sup>1</sup>x.8, 10.  
7 <sup>1</sup>ix.8; <sup>2</sup>iii.5; <sup>3</sup>iv.36, xvi.20.  
8 <sup>2</sup>xiii.9; <sup>3</sup>xi.10.  
9 <sup>1</sup>vi.14; <sup>2</sup>ix.21, xi.9, 13; <sup>3</sup>xiv.18, xvi.20.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xi.3 *ter*; <sup>2</sup>vii.15, viii.28 *bis*, ix.20, 21.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iii.3, ix.20; <sup>2</sup>viii.8, 29, xiv.24, xvi.13; <sup>3</sup>iv.11; <sup>4</sup>xiii.9; <sup>5</sup>v.2, x.13, xv.6; <sup>6</sup>iii.8, xii.8; <sup>7</sup>xv.4; <sup>8</sup>iii.8, 10, x.12, xiv.21, xx.2.  
2.2 <sup>1</sup>i.53, xi.17, xvi.18, 29 *bis*; <sup>2</sup>v.7, xi.5; <sup>3</sup>i.40, iv.24, v.33, vi.14 *bis*, xiv.16, 18, xxi.16.  
3 <sup>1</sup>viii.29, xiii.4.  
4 <sup>1</sup>ii.20, iv.42, xi.15, 16; <sup>2</sup>iv.47, viii.24; <sup>3</sup>iv.38, vii.10.  
5 <sup>1</sup>v.3, xii.29, ix.16; <sup>2</sup>i.50, iv.11; <sup>3</sup>viii.13, xi.12, xxi.16; <sup>4</sup>iv.46, vi.14; <sup>5</sup>xi.17.  
6 <sup>1</sup>i.29, iv.13.  
7 <sup>1</sup>viii.8.  
8 <sup>1</sup>v.3, xi.3, xiii.15, xiv.5; <sup>2</sup>v.12; <sup>3</sup>iii.8, viii.23, ix.19, xi.3, xii.8 *bis*; <sup>4</sup>iv.35, xi.3; <sup>5</sup>viii.6, ix.22 *bis*.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iv.54, viii.3, xxiv.5; <sup>2</sup>vi.14; <sup>3</sup>xv.4, xvi.2; <sup>4</sup>viii.34, ix.18, xvi.2.  
10 <sup>1</sup>iv.35, v.27, viii.27, 31, xiv.23, xx.8.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iii.11, iv.6, 7, xii.6; <sup>2</sup>viii.24; <sup>3</sup>ix.24; <sup>4</sup>iv.12, x.12, xiv.29, xv.1, 3, xvii.4, xxiv.4.  
3.1 <sup>1</sup>x.10.  
2 <sup>2</sup>viii.8, xiv.24.  
3 <sup>3</sup>xi.16.  
4 <sup>2</sup>ii.25, 30.  
5 <sup>3</sup>iv.40.  
6 <sup>1</sup>iv.12, xv.6.  
7 <sup>1</sup>iv.12, xv.6.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.40; <sup>2</sup>v.9, xi.16, 17, xiv.30, xvi.27; <sup>3</sup>iii.6.  
9 <sup>2</sup>viii.8.  
10 <sup>1</sup>iii.12, vii.2; <sup>2</sup>iv.12, 34, xi.17, xv.5.  
11 <sup>1</sup>i.43, 46, 47, 52, iv.35, v.13, xiii.2, xvii.6; <sup>2</sup>xii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.26; <sup>4</sup>vii.9, xvi.18.

## TS. iii.

4.2 <sup>2</sup>iii.12.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.42 *bis*, 52; <sup>2</sup>iv.24; <sup>3</sup>xiii.7; <sup>4</sup>xiii.12.  
4 v.23.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xiii.15, xxi.12.  
8 <sup>2</sup>xiv.23; <sup>3</sup>v.24, viii.4, v.33.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iv.7, 11.  
10 <sup>1</sup>viii.27, xi.17; <sup>2</sup>vii.8.  
11 <sup>2</sup>xii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.10; <sup>4</sup>iii.7, xiii.13, xiv.28; <sup>5</sup>xii.7.  
5.1 <sup>1</sup>vi.9, xiii.15.  
2 <sup>2</sup>xvi.14.  
3 <sup>1</sup>ix.22, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup>xi.10.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xi.16; <sup>2</sup>iii.12; <sup>3</sup>vi.14, xi.16, xxi.12.  
5 <sup>2</sup>ii.25, xvi.14; <sup>3</sup>i.49, iii.2, xi.16, xvi.17.  
6 <sup>1</sup>viii.27; <sup>2</sup>iii.5.  
7 <sup>1</sup>vi.2; <sup>2</sup>v.24, xiv.18.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iii.7, 15, xiv.2, 22.  
10 <sup>1</sup>i.50, iv.10.  
11 <sup>1</sup>i.51, iii.3, 7, 11, v.21, vi.2; <sup>2</sup>iii.12, xvi.18; <sup>3</sup>iii.11, vii.11.

## TS. iv.

1.1 <sup>1</sup>ix.4, 5, 6; <sup>2</sup>vii.6, xi.3; <sup>3</sup>iii.5.  
2 <sup>1</sup>i.61, xvii.5, xxi.11; <sup>2</sup>xii.6 *bis*, xiii.9, 14; <sup>3</sup>ix.23, xiv.5; <sup>4</sup>viii.8; <sup>5</sup>i.61, viii.24, xxi.5.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.52, xii.6; <sup>2</sup>iv.11 *bis*, 19 *bis*, viii.10, ix.18; <sup>3</sup>iii.8, xii.4, 6.  
4 <sup>1</sup>i.61, iii.8; <sup>2</sup>i.61, iii.12, vi.2, vii.2 *bis*; <sup>3</sup>iii.5.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iii.1, 3, 10, vi.2, 4; <sup>2</sup>xvi.2; <sup>3</sup>ix.23.  
6 <sup>1</sup>xii.7.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xi.4; <sup>3</sup>xii.8; <sup>4</sup>viii.24, xii.7.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.2; <sup>2</sup>i.57; <sup>3</sup>iv.20, v.12, xii.7 *bis*, xxiv.5; <sup>4</sup>xii.4; <sup>5</sup>iv.20, 27.  
9 <sup>2</sup>viii.28, xx.2; <sup>3</sup>iii.8, viii.10, xii.7 *bis*, xiv.5.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xii.7, xxi.12; <sup>2</sup>viii.29, xii.7, xiii.12, xiv.1, xvi.19; <sup>3</sup>v.35, vi.14, ix.24, xiii.2, xiv.5, xv.1, xvii.1, 4; <sup>4</sup>iv.11, xii.4; <sup>5</sup>viii.16, 18, xii.7; <sup>6</sup>viii.27, xii.2.  
11 <sup>1</sup>v.17, viii.32; <sup>2</sup>iv.11, xii.4, xiv.19; <sup>3</sup>iv.12, 20; <sup>4</sup>iv.11 *bis*, 19 *bis*, 23 *bis*.  
2.1 <sup>2</sup>ix.3, xii.7; <sup>3</sup>i.60, vi.2.  
2 <sup>2</sup>iii.10, xxi.12; <sup>3</sup>xii.7.  
3 <sup>1</sup>xii.8, 10, xiv.5, xvi.18; <sup>2</sup>iii.10, vi.5, xxi.14; <sup>3</sup>v.17, viii.8, x.10, 25, xii.3; <sup>4</sup>iii.8, xi.5, xvi.23.  
4.2 <sup>2</sup>iii.12.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.42 *bis*, 52; <sup>2</sup>iv.24; <sup>3</sup>xiii.7; <sup>4</sup>xiii.12.  
4 v.23.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xiii.15, xxi.12.  
8 <sup>2</sup>xiv.23; <sup>3</sup>v.24, viii.4, v.33.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iv.7, 11.  
10 <sup>1</sup>viii.27, xi.17; <sup>2</sup>vii.8.  
11 <sup>2</sup>xii.7; <sup>3</sup>iii.10; <sup>4</sup>iii.7, xiii.13, xiv.28; <sup>5</sup>xii.7.  
5.1 <sup>1</sup>vi.9, xiii.15.  
2 <sup>2</sup>xvi.14.  
3 <sup>1</sup>ix.22, xiii.15; <sup>2</sup>xi.10.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xi.16; <sup>2</sup>iii.12; <sup>3</sup>vi.14, xi.16, xxi.12.  
5 <sup>2</sup>ii.25, xvi.14; <sup>3</sup>i.49, iii.2, xi.16, xvi.17.  
6 <sup>1</sup>viii.27; <sup>2</sup>iii.5.  
7 <sup>1</sup>vi.2; <sup>2</sup>v.24, xiv.18.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iii.7, 15, xiv.2, 22.  
10 <sup>1</sup>i.50, iv.10.  
11 <sup>1</sup>i.51, iii.3, 7, 11, v.21, vi.2; <sup>2</sup>iii.12, xvi.18; <sup>3</sup>iii.11, vii.11.

## TS. iv.

2.4 <sup>1</sup>xii.7; <sup>2</sup>xvi.18; <sup>3</sup>iii.5, vii.7, xii.7, xvi.19; <sup>4</sup>xvi.25.  
5 <sup>2</sup>viii.8; <sup>3</sup>iii.12, xiv.9, 11; <sup>4</sup>iii.7; <sup>5</sup>iii.5.  
6 <sup>1</sup>viii.23, x.22; <sup>2</sup>xii.8; <sup>3</sup>iii.2, viii.32; <sup>4</sup>x.22.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xvi.18.  
8 <sup>1</sup>iv.5, vi.2, viii.6, x.15, 19, xiv.5, xx.8; <sup>2</sup>vi.4, viii.8, 9, 32; <sup>3</sup>i.61, ix.20, xi.3, xii.7.  
9 <sup>1</sup>iii.15, v.12, x.13, xii.2, 7; <sup>2</sup>iv.45, viii.28, xiv.23, 29, xx.3, xxi.11; <sup>3</sup>ix.20.  
10 <sup>1</sup>xv.5; <sup>2</sup>xvi.2, 13; <sup>3</sup>iii.15, xii.8.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iv.15, 40, viii.34; <sup>2</sup>iii.5, 10 *bis*; <sup>3</sup>v.16, vi.3, x.16, 19, xxi.4.  
3.1 <sup>1</sup>iv.11, vi.4, x.14 *bis*.  
2 <sup>1</sup>i.82, iv.23; <sup>2</sup>v.3, 36.  
3 <sup>1</sup>iv.33; <sup>2</sup>i.54, 55, ix.16.  
4 <sup>1</sup>xi.3, xv.6; <sup>2</sup>xi.3; <sup>3</sup>viii.25, xi.3.  
5 xvi.27.  
9 <sup>1</sup>vii.2.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iv.20, xi.3 *ter*, 5; <sup>2</sup>vi.13, vii.6; <sup>3</sup>vi.14, xvii.4.  
12 <sup>1</sup>iii.8; <sup>2</sup>vi.13, viii.4; <sup>3</sup>vi.13, xiv.5.  
13 <sup>1</sup>iii.9, vii.12, ix.22, xii.3; <sup>2</sup>iv.11, v.17, x.25; <sup>3</sup>ix.23, xvi.19; <sup>4</sup>iii.10, ix.20, xii.7, xiii.6; <sup>5</sup>vi.5, xi.4; <sup>6</sup>iii.7, v.2, x.13; <sup>7</sup>xiii.9, 15; <sup>8</sup>iii.10.  
4.2 <sup>1</sup>xiv.1, 29, xx.6, 7, xxi.13; <sup>2</sup>xiv.10, 11; <sup>3</sup>iv.12, 52.  
3 <sup>2</sup>xiii.16; <sup>3</sup>xi.17.  
4 <sup>1</sup>v.10, xi.3, xiv.16; <sup>2</sup>xi.3 *bis*, xiii.13; <sup>3</sup>i.38, 41, viii.31, xiv.29, 33, xx.6, 8, xxi.13; <sup>4</sup>v.5, xiv.10, 17; <sup>5</sup>iii.9, 10, vi.5, xii.6, xiv.16.  
5 <sup>1</sup>xiii.12, 15.  
6 <sup>2</sup>vi.12.  
7 <sup>2</sup>xxi.12.  
9 <sup>1</sup>vii.6, xii.8.  
10 <sup>1</sup>iv.12; <sup>2</sup>iii.7, iv.11.  
11 <sup>1</sup>iv.5; <sup>2</sup>v.2, x.13, xi.11, xxi.14.  
12 <sup>1</sup>ix.20, xi.3, 4; <sup>2</sup>xi.3; <sup>3</sup>end'g xxiv.6.  
5.1 <sup>1</sup>iv.43; <sup>2</sup>v.20; <sup>3</sup>xi.3, xii.7; <sup>4</sup>iv.43, 54, ix.21, xiii.9, xiv.8.  
2 <sup>1</sup>iii.7, xii.12.  
3 <sup>1</sup>xvii.1; <sup>2</sup>xi.14, 17.  
4 <sup>2</sup>xii.12.  
5 <sup>1</sup>iv.30, xiii.11; <sup>2</sup>xi.14.  
6 <sup>1</sup>xiv.7.  
8 <sup>1</sup>xi.14.

TS. vi.	TS. vi.	TS. vii.
1.1 'xvi.21; 'iv.17, xiv.11; 'vii.13; 'viii.34; 'xix.3.	4.8 'xvi.29. 9 'viii.23, xiv.17. 10 'iv.40, xiii.13, xiv.28, xviii.3; 'iv. 11; end'g viii.35, xxiv.6.	2.17 xvi.25 bis. 3.1 'xiii.12; 'iii.15. 2 'ix.20. 4 'v.21. 5 'viii.13. 8 'xii.10. 9 'viii.13. 10 'iv.11, xiv.16. 12 v.33, xiv.5, xxi.9,12, xxiv.5.
3 'iv.11,24,38,42 bis, vi.7, viii.16, xiii.6; 'xiii. 6; 'i.34, xiv.5; 'iv. 38, xiii.11.	11 'iv.11, vi.10. 5.1 'viii.32. 2 'xiv.6. 3 'xiv.24; 'xiv.23, xvi.12. 5 'viii.2. 6 'xiv.31. 8 'ii.21, iv.7; 'i.4,58, viii. 27, xv.8, xvi.13; 'i. 59, iii.15, iv.53, viii. 8, end'g xxiv.6.	13 xi.17, xiv.18. 14 ii.30, xiii.9, xvii.1. 15 xiii.14. 16 'i.22, iii.7 bis, x.14; 'ii. 7, xvi.30. 17 x.14, xvi.30. 18 vi.12, xiii.12. 4.2 'v.32, viii.13, ix.18. 3 'vi.14; 'iii.7; 'v.8. 4 'iv.54; 'iv.52. 5 'iv.51, viii.13; 'vii.2. 7 'xiv.1. 8 'iv.52; 'iii.4; 'x.10. 9 xvi.13.
4 'xiii.12; 'vi.4, vii.14. 5 'iv.52, vii.6, xix.3, xxi. 7, xxi.15; 'iii.7, vii. 6; 'vii.6.	10 'xvi.9. 11 'vii.16; 'vi.10, xi.17, xiii.7. 6.1 'xi.9. 2 'xvi.16; 'i.54. 3 'viii.30, xvi.14; 'viii. 33; 'v.33. 4 'xiii.16; 'xvi.13; 'i.30, 59, iv.35, x.10; 'v.14. 5 'vi.10, x.10; 'xiv.20. 7 'xi.12. 8 'iv.28.	10 'vi.13; 'vii.8. 11 'vi.2,13; 'iv.12; 'iv. 53. 13 iii.7, xiv.16, xxi.16. 15 ii.10, xi.17, xvi.30. 17 'xi.6. 19 'x.10, xi.17, xvi.18; 'xiii.12, xvi.2; 'xvi. 13.
6 'i.48, xiv.1,5; 'iv.42, viii.31; 'ix.22; 'iv. 23, xiii.9,12, xxi.7.	10 'x.10, xvi.29. 11 'v.32, xiv.12,13, xxi.4; 'iv.11, vii.11; 'xvi.6.	20 viii.8, xi.6,7, xiii.12,15, xv.8, xvi.18, xx.7. 21 vi.12 5.1 'xiii.14; 'iv.11, viii.14, xvi.29; 'xvi.12. 2 'ii.47, vi.3, ix.14, x.19, xvi.27; 'vi.12, x.17, xvi.12, xx.5. 3 'iv.11, xvi.12,17; 'iv. 11. 5 'x.10; 'xvii.4. 6 'iv.26; 'iv.42; 'vi. 14. 7 'iv.42,52, ix.17; 'iii.8, xi.13. 8 'xiii.6; 'v.19. 9 'xiii.16, xiv.4; 'xiii.13; 'vii.16; 'viii.16, xiv. 8.
7 'viii.9; 'i.59. 8 'iv.44,45. 9 'i.58, viii.23, ix.9, x.19, xv.7,8; 'x.10, xiii.13; 'v.19.	TS. vii.	10 vii.16. 11 'x.10, xvi.29; 'vii.2, xiii.12; 'x.10. 12 xiv.29. 13 'x.10. 14 'x.10. 15 'x.10. 16 'x.10. 17 'x.10. 18 'x.10. 19 'x.10. 20 'x.10. 21 'x.10. 22 'x.10. 23 'x.10. 24 'x.10. 25 'x.10.
10 'iv.2, xi.16 bis, xiii.12, xiv.6; 'xi.17. 11 'vii.16; 'ix.17. 2.1 'iii.7, vii.4; 'iv.12,33; 'ix.22. 2 'iii.8. 3 'v.7; 'viii.8; 'v.18. 4 'ii.25, x.10,17, xx.5,6; 'viii.17. 6 'ix.21; 'vii.6, xvi.9. 8 'iv.11; 'xiv.13. 9 'iv.11 bis; 'iv.33; 'v. 10, vi.8, xvi.2 bis, xx. 8.	1.1 'xvii.1; 'xiv.18,31, xvi. 13. 3 'vi.14; 'v.20. 4 'iv.11, xx.2, xxi.11. 5 'vi.14; 'v.22; 'x.10, xii.11, xiv.31; 'xx.7. 6 'x.24, xv.7, xxiv.5; 'xvi.29; 'xiv.6; 'xiii.12; 'iii.15, v.9, vii.5, xiii.12, xiv.2,31, 26; 'xi.17. 7 'xiii.9. 8 'vi.12, x.17, xx.5,8. 9 ix.21. 12 x.10. 19 'v.12, vi.12, vii.5, xiii. 14, xvi.22; 'v.14, xvi.22. 2.1 'iv.52; 'ii.24; 'x.10. 2 'ii.25. 4 'xiii.9. 5 'viii.4. 6 'i.31; 'iv.54. 7 'viii.10, xi.16. 8 'vii.6, viii.13. 9 'iv.11. 10 'xi.13, xvi.29; 'vii.2, xiii.12; 'x.10. 13 xvi.25, xxi.14. 15 ii.44, v.3, vii.2, viii.2.	22 'xvi.29. 23 'xvi.29. 24 'iv.20, xi.13. 25 'xiii.13; 'xviii.1.

- adyā*, iii.5,8 (instead of *aghd*).  
*adyā nū*, xii.7.  
*adruta*, xxiii.20.  
*adharānt sapainān*, ix. 22.  
*adharoshṭha*, cii.39,43.  
*adhastāt*, cii.28.  
*adhā*, iii.9.  
*adhāyī*, xii.7.  
*adhī*, i.15.  
*adhika*, xvii.5:-cii.11,25,28, xvi.19, xvii.1: and *ādhi-kyā*.  
*adhikaraṇa*, c.159.  
*adhikāra*, ci.12, ii.1, iii.1, iv.1,8, etc.  
*adhikāraka*, xxii.6:-c xx.3.  
*adhigama*, ci.1.  
*adhishavane*, iv.11.  
*adhī*, iii.7.  
*adhyaṇa*, ci.1, xiv.4,5,28.  
*adhyarāha*, ii.28:-cii.25,28, xi.19, xxi.1.  
*adhyāya*, ci.61, x.15, xii.1, xiii.3,15, xiv.4, xix.5, xxiv.2, and endings of chapters.  
*adhyetār*, cii.34, xvii.8, xxiv. 5.  
*adhvara*, xi.18.  
*adhvaram viṣvataḥ*, viii.32.  
*adhvaryo*, xii.8.  
*anadvān*, v.21.  
*anadātā*, iii.12.  
*anadhikrītava*, cvii.15.  
*anantaḥ*, viii.8.  
*anantara*, i.41,44, xxiii.16:-ci.1, ii.1, iii.1 etc., iv.53, x.12, xvi.13.  
*anantodātta*, xvi.5.  
*anapeksha*, c xiv.18.  
*anamivah*, xi.17.  
*anartha*, cix.23.  
*anarthaka*, civ.23, viii.13, ix.8,23v, xiv.15, xxi.5.  
*anavagraha*, ciii.8,10,12-4.  
*anavasthā*, c xiv.22.  
*anādeṣa*, ii.20:-c ii.21.  
*anddyūdātta*, viii.10.  
*-anān*, vi.14.  
*anāmikā*, cxxiii.17.  
*anārsha*, cix.22.  
*anīhgyānta*, viii.13:-c viii.8.  
*anītya*, c vi.14.  
*anishṭa*, ci.4,21, ii.20, iv.23, v.3,31, ix.6, x.11, xiii.3, xiv.22, xvi.29.  
*anishṭrītaḥ*, xi.4.  
*anī*, vii.12.  
*anu*, xi.5,7.
- anukarṣhaṇa*, c xiv.28.  
*anuccāraṇa*, c iv.23.  
*anuttama*, xiv.24, xxi.12.  
*anuddātta*, i.39,45,46, iii.15, iv.43, vi.4, viii.9, x.12,16, xi.9,10, xiv.29, xvi.8, xviii.2, xx.2, xxi.10:-c x.10, xii.6, xxii.10, xxiii.16,17.  
*anuddātātara*, c i.44.  
*anunāsika*, ii.30, v.26-8, 31, x.11, xv.1,6, xxii.14:-ci.1, ii.19,30, v.29-31, xiv.23, xv.7-9, xvii.1 (-tā): and *sānun*, *anunāsikya*.  
*anupada*, c xxiv.6.  
*anupapatti*, c iv.23, xiv.4.  
*anupapanna*, ci.21,59, iv.23 (-tā). v.26,35, viii.18, xvi.2.  
*anupalabdhī*, xxiii.7.  
*anupadāna*, ii.8, xxiii.2:-ci.9,10.  
*anurodha*, ci.2, xiv.5,28, xx.12.  
*anuvartana*, c ix.9, x.14, xiii.16.  
*anuvāka*, ci.61, iii.9, iv.25, 26,48,52, ix.20, xi.3, xvii.6v, xviii.3v.  
*anuvrtti*, civ.40, viii.23, xvi.13.  
*anusāra*, ci.21,57,59, iv.52.  
*anusāriva*, c xiii.16.  
*anusārīn*, c xiii.16.  
*anusvāra*, i.18,34, ii.19,30, xv.3, xvii.1,3, xxi.6, xxii.15:-ci.1,60, ii.25,33, viii.15, xvi.2-15,17-23,25-31, xvii.5.  
*anū*, iii.7.  
*anūkāra*, iv.52.  
*anūshnavant*, iii.15.  
*anṛṇah*, xi.17.  
*anṛte*, iv.11.  
*aneka*, i.26.  
*anekārtha*, ci.1 (-tva), vi.13, viii.28 (-tva).  
*ankāra*, i.53.  
*anta*, i.55 (-vat), ii.17,40,43, 48, iv.3, vii.16, xii.15, xv.5, xxii.14,15, xxiii.15:-ci.21 etc.: and *iṅgyānta*.  
*antah*, viii.10,32.  
*antahpātūva*, civ.23, viii.18, xii.3.  
*antataḥ*, c xix.3.  
*antamah*, xi.13.  
*antara*, v.40, ix.16, xxiii.17:-c x.3 etc.: and *anant*, *ekānt*.
- antar āsyām*, xii.7.  
*antarā*, iv.20.  
*antarātmān*, ci.41.  
*antarhita*, xiv.30.  
*antasthā*, i.8, v.28, xxi.7:-ci.1, xiv.28.  
*antodātta*, xvi.5:-c viii.10.  
*antya*, i.58:-c viii.4, x.13,18.  
*andhak*, xi.10.  
*annāya*, xii.7.  
*anneshu*, xi.17.  
*anya*, ii.11,33, xxii.14:-ci.19, ii.2,19, ix.1, xiv.5, xv.9.  
*anyah*, vii.16.  
*anyatarataḥ*, xix.1.  
*anyat-rastha*, c xiv.5.  
*anyatva*, xxii.2.  
*anyathā*, ci.42 etc.  
*anyānt*, vii.16.  
*anyādbhīh*, vii.16.  
*anyoyānvaya*, ci.49, ii.7.  
*anyāya*, ci.1, xiv.15, xvi.23: and *anyomyānv*, *purā-parānv*.  
*anvārtha*, ci.3.  
*anvavasarga*, xxii.10.  
*anvākarṣhaka*, ci.34, x.17.  
*anvācya*, cxi.14, xx.10.  
*anvādeṣa*, i.58:-c iv.3,16, vi.3, vii.3,6, viii.12, ix.22, xi.4,6,11, xii.6, xiv.4, xxii.5.  
*anvādeṣaka*, xxii.5:-ci.52, ii.13,18, v.30, vi.3, xi.4, xiv.6,8,20, xv.4, xvi.3.  
*apah*, xi.6.  
*apara*, ci.21, xi.1, xv.7,9.  
*aparā*, xi.12.  
*aparigraha*, c xvi.29.  
*apuvāda*, ci.13, iv.2, vi.5, viii.4, xii.8, xvi.11.  
*apuvādaka*, c xiv.5,6.  
*apaṣu*, ci.14.  
*apasah*, viii.24.  
*apā*, iii.12.  
*apānī napāt*, xi.8.  
*api*, i.26,43,51,52, iv.4,51, vii.5, viii.12, xiii.7, xiv.30, xv.8, xvi.3,15, xx.3, xxii.5,14, xxiv.4.  
*apī dādhamā*, xii.7.  
*apīdhāna*, c xvi.3.  
*apūpam*, xii.7.  
*apūva*, xx.2.  
*aprīta*, i.54, ix.16:-c ix.17.  
*apeksha*, cii.35, iv.2, ix.22 (-kshatva), xiv.18, xv.9, xxii.5,11: and *anap*, *nir-ap*, *sāp*.  
*apyetu*, ix.22.  
*apragraha*, xv.6.



- ākāra, iv.40, ix.20, xvi.14.  
 16 (and-).  
 ākhyā, i.16, 27:—ci.16, 17, 19-  
 23, 27, 28.  
 āgama, i.23, xxiv.5:—ci.24,  
 53, 60, v.4-8, 32, 33, 40, 41,  
 ix.16, xiv.5-11, 23, xv.3-  
 5, xvi.2-31, xxi.12.  
 Āgñiveya, see p. 430.  
 Āgñiveyāyana, see p. 430.  
 āh, ci.1.15, iv.23.  
 ā ca, ix.22.  
 ācārya, xxiv.6:—ci.47, ix.4,  
 x.21, 22, xiv.4, xv.8, xviii.  
 1, 3, xxiii.18; and see p.  
 430.  
 āṇāraḥ, xiii.12.  
 ādāśit, xvi.13.  
 ātī, xiv.8.  
 ātmaka, cxiv.28, xxii.1.  
 Ātreya, c intr., v.1; and see  
 p. 430.  
 ādī, i.41, 46, 52, 53, 55, ii.26,  
 47, iii.1, xvi.29, xxi.4,  
 xxiii.15; (=etc.), v.40,  
 xxiii.11, xxiv.4.  
 āditāḥ, i.2, 5:—ci.47, xxiii.  
 10.  
 ādepa, ci.52, iii.8, ix.7, x.19,  
 xiii.16; and anid-.  
 ādepaka, ci.33.  
 ādya, i.7.  
 ādyudatta, vi.14:—c vii.8:  
 and anā-.  
 ādhikya, cxxiv.3.  
 ān, iii.15.  
 -ān mahā, iv.34.  
 ānantarya, ci.1, ii.1.  
 ānukūlya, ci.46.  
 ānundāsika, ii.52, xvii.1:—  
 cxvii.3, 4; and sān-.  
 ānupada, cxxiv.6.  
 ānupūrvya, i.1, 10; ii.44, xxi.  
 12, xxii.13:—ci.1, xvii.4.  
 ānumānika, ci.9.  
 r. āp, c viii.11-15, ix.17, x.  
 2, 4-8, 10, 11, xiii.7, 8, xiv.  
 3, 21; +pra, ii.32, 34, 35,  
 ix.13, x.13, xi.4, xiii.16,  
 xvi.29; and prāpāna,  
 prāpta, prāpti, ativyāpti.  
 āpāḥ, iv.25, xi.5, 8.  
 āpatti, ci.37, 51, v.24, 31, 35,  
 viii.13, xii.3, xiv.12.  
 āpādaka, c v.35.  
 ā pūshā, x.13.  
 ā prshati, iv.15.  
 āpo hi, vi.2.  
 ābhāsātā, ci.25  
 ābhīḥ, vi.5.  
 āy, ix.14.  
 āy ajishṭhaḥ, ix.22  
 āyan, v.21.  
 āyama, xxii.9.  
 āyuh, vi.5, 13.  
 āyo, xii.8.  
 ār, x.9.  
 ārambha, ci.60, ii.20, 23, v.  
 10, 41, vi.3, viii.8, 16, 24,  
 ix.13, 21, x.22, xii.1, 6,  
 xiii.10, xiv.22, 24, xvi.4, 6,  
 18, xx.10, xxii.1.  
 ārambhana, c v.1, xiv.3.  
 āritā, iii.10.  
 āropaniya, cxiv.9, 9 (-tva).  
 ārthika, ci.59.  
 ārdhnuvan, v.21.  
 ārsha, ix.21, x.13:—c ix.23,  
 xxiv.2.  
 āv, ix.15.  
 āvāḥ, viii.9.  
 āvīḥ, viii.24.  
 āvinnaḥ, xi.15.  
 āvṛt, viii.11.  
 āvṛtti, ci.81v.  
 ācīḥ, v.10.  
 ācārya, cxxiv.2.  
 ācāryana, ci.1.  
 ācāryatva, ci.1, viii.18.  
 r. ās: + adhi, cxiv.4.  
 āsate ye, xi.16.  
 āsanna, i.25.  
 āstām, iv.52.  
 āhuti, iii.7, iv.15.  
 āhvaraka, xxiii.14.  
 r. ī: + adhi, xxiv.5:—c xviii.  
 7, xxiv.6v; +prati, ci.30,  
 42, ii.41, iv.11, v.7, xviii.  
 1, xix.3, xx.10, xxiii.16:  
 and adhyayana, adhyetar,  
 vyaveta, etc.  
 ākāra, ii.28.  
 r. iṅg: + ut, xvii.8.  
 āngya, i.48:—ci.49, iii.8, iv.  
 10.  
 āṅgyānta, iv.10, viii.13 (an-):  
 —c viii.13, 13 (-tva).  
 ādāḥ, viii.24.  
 ādāvān, ix.21.  
 ātaratra, c viii.14.  
 ātarathā, c v.12.  
 āti, i.15, 29, 30, 46, 47, ii.3, iii.  
 7, iv.3, 10, vi.10, 15, 31, xiii.  
 4, 14, xiv.33, xvi.12, 30,  
 xvii.1-4, 7, 8, xviii.2, xx.2,  
 8, xxii.5-10, 13, xxiii.2,  
 16, 19, 20, xxiv.2, 3, 6.  
 ātipara, iv.4, viii.12, ix.20  
 (an-):—ci.15 (-tva), ix.2  
 (an-), 21 (-tva), 23 (do.).  
 ātīvat, ci.7 etc.  
 ātīham, ci.2.  
 āity evam, v.18.  
 id agne, v.17.  
 idam etc., i.46, ii.51.  
 id u, v.17.  
 idānim, ci.43, ix.11  
 indra, vii.2.  
 indrah, vii.8, xi.9.  
 indrā, iii.3.  
 indriya, cxxi.15 (-vishaya).  
 indriyā, iii.5.  
 indro me, ix.22.  
 imām naḥ, v.17.  
 ime, iv.24.  
 iya eva sādya, xi.3.  
 irāvati, iv.22.  
 iwa, xvii.8.  
 ivarna, ii.22, x.4, 15, xx.1.  
 r. ish, ich, cv.1, viii.15:  
 + abhi, ci.9; and ishṭa,  
 ishṭi.  
 ishṭa, ci.46, v.37, 41, viii.  
 22, x.21, xiv.3, 9, 13, 26, 33,  
 xv.2, 7, 9, xvi.16, 24, xvii.  
 7, xviii.5, 7, xix.3; and  
 ani-.  
 ishṭak, iv.44.  
 ishṭā, iii.6.  
 ishṭi, iv.52.  
 iḥā, ix.22.  
 ikāra, iv.8, ix.20, xvi.14.  
 r. iksh: + vi, c intr.; + apa,  
 c v.24 (amupekshya); and  
 apekshā.  
 iḍenyān, ix.22.  
 im, v.12.  
 iyuḥ, vi.5.  
 r. ir: + sam, ci.2.  
 irayaṭhā, iii.10.  
 ishāt, ii.15.  
 u, xxii.14.  
 u, vi.2.  
 ukāra, ii.29, viii.21, ix.16,  
 x.15, 22, xx.1.  
 ukta, i.61, xxiii.19:—c iv.23  
 (-tva).  
 ukṭi, ci.61, ii.23, iii.7, viii.  
 13, x.9, 12.  
 ukthā, iii.2.  
 ukshatā, iii.10.  
 ukhya, ix.20, xi.3:—ci.61,  
 ix.23 (-tva).  
 Ukhya, see p. 430.  
 ugaṇā, xiii.12.  
 r. uc: ucita, cxvii.7.  
 ucca, i.38 (uccāḥ), xxiii.20:—  
 ci.18, xviii.4, xx.2.  
 uccā, v.8.  
 uccāraṇa, ci.iii.1, iv.11, x.23,  
 xvi.13, xxi.5, xxii.9; and  
 anu-.  
 uccāḥkara, xxii.9.

*āirayan*, v.21.

*okāra*, ii.13, iv.6, ix.7,12, x.5,7,22, xi.1. xviii.1.

*oṃkāra*, ci.1.

*otva*, ci.51, viii.8,16,19,21, ix.7,8, xi.5. xvi.29.

*oḍman*, x.14.

*one*, vii.10.

*oshadhī*, iii.7.

*oshadhīh*, v.17.

*oshṭha*, ii.12 (-hanu), 14,21, 24,39: -ci.25, xxiii.2: and *adharo-*, *uttaro-*.

*oshṭha*, x.14.

*oshṭhānta*, ii.43.

*oshṭhya*, ci.25.

*dukāra*, ii.26, ix.15, x.7.

*ka* (k), viii.23, ix.4.

*ka* (pron.), xviii.2 (*cit*): *ke-cit*, ci.57, viii.15, xi.1,3,9, xii.3, xiii.13, xiv.4,5,11, 15, xv.9, xvi.2,12, xxiii.17.

*kah*, viii.9.

*kakāra*, v.32, viii.31.

*kakut*, viii.4.

*kakshivān*, ix.21.

*kathinātā*, cxxii.9.

*kaṇṭha*, ii.2,3,4,46, xxiii.10: -ci.47, xxii.10, xxiii.2, 17v (-mūliya).

*kaṇṭhokta*, ci.59,59 (-*tva*), iii.8, iv.41.

*kaṇṭhokti*, ci.14,59, vi.3,5, viii.16.

*kaṇva*, xiii.9.

*r. kaṭh*, ci.11,53, ii.33,47, v.28, xi.3, xv.9, xviii.3, xxiii.17.

*kathāna*, civ.23, v.26, xx.7, xxiii.17.

*kanishṭhikā*, cxxiii.17.

*kaninike*, iv.11.

*kanīyā*, xvi.13.

*kapālān*, vi.14.

*kam u*, vi.2.

*r. kamp*: + *pra*, cix.3.

*kampa*, cix.3,5.

*r. kar*, ii.4: -ci.61. v.3,35, etc.; *kārya*, ci.14 etc.;

*karāṇīya*, cxxii.12; + *adhī*, ci.1, viii.5, xii.9, xiv.14, xxii.6; *adhikṛta*, ci.1, iv.1, etc.: and *adhī-kāra* etc., *kārya*, *anadhī-kṛta* etc., *kārya*, *anadhī-kṛta*, *praktā*, *viktā* etc., *vāhikṛta*.

*karāṇa*, ii.27,32,34,45, xxiii.2,6 (-*vat*): -ci.20 etc., xxiii.2, xxiv.5.

*kareṇu*, cxxi.15.

*karō*, viii.30.

*kārṇa*, civ.52, xxiii.17 (-*mūliya*).

*karṇakā*, iii.5.

*karṭṭva*, ci.2.

*karmatva*, ci.2.

*karmadhāraya*, cx.6.

*kurman*, cxxi.14, xxii.3.

*karvīṇa*, cxxi.15.

*r. karsh*: + *anu*, ci.51, viii.34, xxiii.18; + *ā*, ci.22,43, ii.17, vii.6,7, viii.4,15, ix.4,20, etc.; + *saṃni*, ci.15,

24,27, iv.23, xi.3: and *krṣṭa*, *anukarṣhaṇa*, *an-vākarṣhaka*, *ākarṣhaka*, *saṃnikarṣha*.

*r. kalp*, xiv.28; + *vī*, ci.21.

*kalpayanti*, iv.15.

*kalyāṇi*, xiii.12.

*kavarga*, ii.35: -ci.44.

*Kaṣyapa*, cxxiv.6 (-*gotra*).

*kāṭakṣhi*, cix.21 (-*vat*).

*kāṇa*, xiii.9.

*kāṇḍa*, ci.61, iii.9, ix.20.

*Kāṇḍamāyana*, see p. 430.

*kāmacāra*, ci.7.

*kāra*, i.16, xxii.4.

*kārāṇa*, ci.1, xvi.26, xxiii.3,19.

*kārya*, ci.55,60 (*sva*), ii.13, iv.3,7,11, v.1, viii.13,15, ix.7,24 (*sva*), xiv.5, xvi.2, xix.5 (*anu*), xxiv.2.

*kāryabhāj*, ci.25,55,58,61, iii.1, iv.23 (-*tva*), xix.4 (*anu*).

*kārṣhṇi*, iv.12.

*kāla*. i.33 (*samāna*), 37, xvii.5: -ci.1,35,36, vi.4, x.12, xi.19, xxi.1, xxii.13, xxiii.2, xxiv.5,6: and *padak-*.

*Kālanirṇaya*, cxviii.1.

*kīṇṣīla*, *kīṇṣīlā*, xvi.26.

*kīmca*, ci.21, ii.47, iv.23, v.22, etc.

*kīṇṣu*, ci.21,53,61, ii.18,23-5, iv.23, vii.15, viii.13, ix.7, etc.

*ku* (= *kavarga*), ci.47:

*r. kuc*: + *saṃ*, ci.15.

*kuṇḍapaṇa*, xiii.12.

*kuṇḍala*, -*līn*, civ.52.

*kuṭṭhi*, ci.18,21, ii.23, v.22, etc.

*kuṭra*, civ.23.

*kuṭṭā*, iii.10.

*kurū*, v.6.

*kuryāt*, iv.52.

*kūṭastha*, cv.2.

*krṇutā*, xiii.10.

*krṇudhvāṇ sadane*, iv.11.

*krṇvan*, vi.14.

*krḍhi*, viii.26.

*krḍhi suvaḥ*, vii.2.

*krḍhi*, iii.13.

*krṣamadhya*, cxxiv.6.

*krṣṭa*, xxiii.12,14.

*krṣhṇaḥ*, iv.38.

*krṣṇāṅghri*, cxxiv.6.

*kena*, vii.8.

*kevala*, ci.18,43,59, ii.47, xiv.33, xxi.1,2, xxiv.4.

*kāivalya*, cxx.12v.

*komala*, cxx.12.

*kāṇḍeṇyaḥ*, xiii.12.

*Kāṇḍīnya*, see p. 430.

*Kāṇḍaleya*, see p. 430.

*krā*, vii.26.

*krāṇsyate*, xvi.22.

*krato*, xii.8.

*r. kram*: + *atī*, civ.23, xvii.8, xxiv.4; + *pra*, cx.15.

*krāma*, xxi.16, xxiii.20, xxiv.5,6: -ci.9, xxiii.16, xxiv.2.

*krāyī*, iii.13.

*krīyā*, cxxiv.4.

*r. krūṣ*, cvi.9.

*krūṣṭa*, cxxiii.12-4v.

*krūrāma*, iv.25.

*kvacit*, cxiv.28, xxi.6, etc.

*kṣha* (*kṣh*), ix.3.

*kṣhāmā*, iii.10.

*r. kṣhīp*: + *adhī*, cxv.9; + *nī*, ci.18; + *pra*, cxiv.11.

*kṣhīra*, cxviii.8, xxi.1.

*kṣhāpīra*, xx.1,9: -cxx.8.

*kha* (*kh*), viii.23.

*kha*, xxii.9,10.

*khanana*, ci.1.

*khaṭu*, ci.18, ii.23, iv.32,37, etc.

*khi*, xiv.8.

*r. khyā*: + *ā*, cix.20, xx.8; + *vyā*, cxxiii.16, xiv.5, xxii.3: and *ākhyā*, *vyā-khyāna*, *saṃkhyā* etc.

*gākāra*, cxiv.23.

*r. gaṇ*, cxvii.6v.

*gaṇa*, xiii.9.

*r. gad*: + *nī*, ci.60.

*r. gam*, i.50, xxiv.6: -ci.133, xiv.3,4v; + *ava*, ci.33v, 51, x.7; + *upa*, cxvi.3; + *saṃ*, cv.1: and *adhī-gama*.

*gamāṇikā*, ci.18, viii.16.

*gamayataḥ*, iv.52.

*r. gar*: + *saṃ*, ci.21, xii.1.

ta (t), v.33, vii.13, xiii.15.	tishthā, iii.12.	dadhāsi, xvi.18.
taiva, ci.21.	tvratara, xvii.1, 4: -c xvi.24.	danta, ii.43: -cii.18 (-pañkti).
tavarga, ii.37, xiii.11, xiv.	xvii.2, 3 (-tva).	dantamāla, ii.38, 41, 42.
20: -cii.44, xiv.28.	tu, i.19, 59, ii.14, 25, 29, 33, 45,	r. dar: + d, cix.21, xiii.16.
tavargiya, cxiii.14.	iv.40, viii.16. ix.9, x.19,	darvi, iv.12.
tha (th), vii.14.	21, xi.1, xiv.5, 11, xv.3, 8,	r. darç, ci.1, ii.2, 5, iv.11,
da (d), xiii.16.	xviii.1, xx.2, xxii.6, xxiv.	viii.16, ix.22, x.10, xiv.5,
dhāra, civ.38.	5.	28.
na (n), xxi.14.	tu, iv.42, v.13.	darçana, ci.59, ii.1, iii.1
nakāra, vii.1, xiii.6.	tulya, ci.33, ii.19 (-tva), xiv.	(ad-), xi.19 (ad-), xii.3
natva, ci.51, 60, v.3, vii.2	23.	(ad-), xiv.5, 15, xv.9v, xvi.
etc., xiii.7 etc.	tū, iii.14.	26.
nīc, ci.17.	tūnave, xiii.12.	r. dā: + anupra, cii.8; + u-
ta (t), vii.13.	tūshnim, ci.20 (-bhāva,	pā, cii.7, 8: and anupra-
ta (pron.), i.33, 41, 49, ii.3, 7,	-bhūta), xxiii.6 (-bhāva).	dāna, upādāna.
31-4, v.27, 38, ix.2, xii.9,	tr, xvi.27.	dādhāra, iv.22.
xiv.9, xix.3, 4, xx.4, xxi.2,	trape, iv.11.	dārūnya, xxii.9.
13, xxii.2, xxiii.13, 16-9.	trtiya, i.11, viii.3, xxiii.12,	dārḍhya, cxvii.1.
takāra, v.22, 33, vi.5, 14, vii.	16: -ci.61 (-tva), xxiii.10	dāçvā, xvi.13.
15.	(-savana).	divah, viii.24, 28.
tāt, ix.17.	trāye, iv.11.	divi, vi.2.
tatah, xv.3, xxii.14.	te, iv.40, 42, xi.10.	r. dāç: + d, cxx.4v; + anvā,
tatra, v.3, xxii.3, 12.	te asya, iv.20.	ci.26, 32, 51, 55, 60, ii.19,
tatrā, iii.8.	te dcaranti, iv.20.	etc.; + ut, civ.2, 52, x.11:
tathā, xxii.14.	Tāittirīya, xxiii.16, 15 (-ka).	+ upa, xxiii.18: -ci.1, 60,
tathātva, ci.43, ii.20.	tāirovyañjana, xx.7, 12: -	xvii.1, xxiii.6, 17; + nih,
tathābhāva, ci.61.	civ.29, xx.8.	ci.29, ii.7, 23, x.23, xiii.
tadānim, ci.21.	trapu, v.4.	9v, xxiii.17, xxiv.5; + pra-
taddhita, cxiii.9.	tri, i.20, xxiii.11, 14.	tiñh, ci.7: and anvāde-
tanuvāu, iv.44.	tri, vii.2, xvi.25.	ça, -çaka, ādeça, -çaka,
tanūyat, iv.52.	trih, i.36.	nirdeça, -çaka.
tantu, ci.7.	tripadaprabhrti. i.61: -ci.	r. dāh: + sam, cxiv.4.
tapatā, iii.12.	59, 61 (-tva), xi.9, 18:	dādivā, xvi.13.
tapasah, xii.8.	Tribhāshyaratna, cintr. and	dīpa, cxviii.3, xx.12 (-vat).
tapasī, iv.17.	endings of chapters.	dṛptiya, xxiii.13.
tamasah, viii.24.	trimātra, xxii.13.	dṛyā, iii.12.
r. tar: + ava, ci.9.	trirūpa, ci.36.	dūrgha, i.3, 35, viii.17, x.2,
taratā, iii.12.	tri, vi.2.	xxii.14, xxiv.5: -cii.24,
tarā, iii.8.	trin, vi.14.	iii.1, v.12, etc.: and dāir-
tarhān, vi.14.	trāvidhya, ci.3.	ghya.
tarhi, ci.15, 21, ii.25, iii.8,	tvah, xi.5.	dīrghā, iii.5.
etc.	tvam tarā, iii.8.	dulçhishṭa, cxiii.16.
tavarga, ii.38, xiv.20, 21: -	r. tvar: atvaritam, cxxiii.	dundubhī, cxxiii.3.
ci.44.	20.	durbala, cxvi.19, xxi.1.
tavargiya, xiii.15.	tvashṭah, viii.8.	duryān, ix.21.
tasthivā xvi.13.	tvā, iii.5.	ṛ, xvi.27.
tasmāt, ix.17.	tvishī, iii.7.	ṛdha, xvii.6, xx.9 (-tara):
tasmin, vi.14.	tve, iv.10.	-cix.5, xx.10.
tātparya, ci.15, 24, 35, 36.	tha (th), iv.7, vii.14.	ṛdhay, cxxiii.19.
tān, vi.14.	-thē, iv.40.	ṛdhe, iv.27.
tābhyaṁ eva, iv.52.	da (d), iv.7.	ṛshānta, cxiii.15.
tāmra, cxxiv.6.	dañçukā, dañshṭrā-	devu rishah, viii.24.
tāra, xxii.11, xxiii.5, 10.	ḍhyaṁ, dañsam, dañ-	devatā phalguni, iv.12.
tāu, ii.22, 36, 40.	sanābhyaḥ, dañso-	devate, iv.11.
tāvāt, i.35: -ci.1, 41, 56, ii.3,	-bhīh, xvi.19.	Devadatta, ci.14, iv.52.
25, viii.16.	dukāra, v.8.	devā, iii.2.
tishṭhan, vi.14.	dakshinendā, iii.10.	devān, vi.14.
tishṭhantya ekayā, v.19.	datte, xi.5.	Devipurāna, cxxiv.6.
	dadāsi, xvi.18.	deça, i.59: -ci.29, ii.17, viii.
	dadhānāh, xii.6.	21, xix.3.
		deha, cvi.9.
		dāirghya, cxxii.9.

- nicāstara*, i.44.  
*nu*, v.13.  
*nudā*, iii.8.  
*nū*, iii.14.  
*nūnam*, vii.16.  
*nr*, vii.9.  
*nrtyanti*, vii.16.  
*nemir devān*, vi.14.  
*neshtah*, viii.8.  
*nāimītika*, c ix.22, xiv.28v.  
*nāiruntarya*, c xix.3.  
*nyāya*, c i.59, ii 17,25,51v,  
 iv.23,51. v.35, viii.16, xi.  
 18, xiii.15, xiv.4, xvi.19.  
*nyāyya*, c xiv.5.  
*nyūna*. c intr., i.42 (-*tva*),  
 ii.23,23 (-*tva*), xxiii.20.  
*-nvati*, iv.29.  
  
*pa* (p), iv.28,30.  
*pākāra*, v.36, viii.23.  
*paksha*, c iv.23,40, v.30, viii.  
 13, ix.6, x.20, xiv.10,11,  
 17, xv.3, xviii.5,7.  
*pañka*, c iv.23, xiv.4.  
*pañktī*, c ii.18.  
*pañcan*, i.10.  
*pañcana*, xxiii.2: -c xxi.14  
 (-*ma*).  
*pañcaviṅcati*, i.7.  
*paṭa*, c ii.7, v.28.  
*r. paṭa*, c i.61, v.1,2, ix.20,  
 xxiv.3,5.  
*paṇi*, *paṇim*, xiii.10.  
*paṇeta*, xiii.12.  
*paṇāṅgān*, ix.23.  
*Paṇāṅgāṇi*, c xxi.1.  
*pataye*, *patih*, *patim*,  
 viii.27.  
*patir nah*, xi.16.  
*pati*, iv.35, viii.27.  
*pate*, viii.27, xii.8.  
*patni*, vi.7.  
*patni ve*, viii.27.  
*pathe*, viii.25.  
*r. pad*: + *a*, c iii.1-15. v.9,  
 10,20-25,34-7, vii.1-14,  
 etc.; *āpanna*, c i.51, v.35,  
 x.10, xvi.3,15; *āpād*, c ii.  
 7, xxi.6; + *ut*, c vii.15; +  
*upa*, c i.1. ii.47, iv.3,52, v.  
 1,35, viii.18, xiv.28, xvi.  
 19; + *nih*, c xiv.5; + *prā-*  
*ti*, c vi.13, viii.15; + *sam*,  
 xxiii.20: and *anupapana*,  
*āpatti*, *āpādaka*, *ūpat-*  
*ti*, *upapatti*, *nishpādya*,  
*pratiṣpatti*.  
*pad*, iv.44.  
*pada*, i.50,54, vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xvi.17, xx.2,6, xxii.  
 13 (-*virāma*): -c v.1,2,3,  
 10,12, vi.8, viii.33, ix.1,  
 xiv.5, xx.2, xxiv.6. etc.; *parimāṇa*,  
 xxiii.2: -c i.37.  
 and *ekap*, *nānāp*, *prakṛ-*  
*tip*, *saṁanap-*  
*padakāla*, c i.60. vi.4, viii.9,  
 xv.7, xx.2,4v.  
*padakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*padagrahaṇa*, i.50: -c i.51-3.  
 iv.11, v.12. ix.22.  
*padapāṭha*, c iv.5, v.2.  
*padasaṁhitā*, xxiv.2 3: -  
 c xiii.5,14, xxiv.4.  
*padasamaya*, c vi.14.  
*padōdī*, xvi.2 8: -c iii.1,15,  
 etc.  
*padinta*, xiv.28, xvi.14: -  
 c iii.1, iv.3 (*ap*-), 5, ix.11-  
 15 etc. xiii.13 (-*tva*).  
*padārtha*, c xiii.14.  
*padī*, vi.2.  
*padāikadeṇa*, c i.23,50, iv.35,  
 54, vi.10,12, vii.6,11, viii.  
 23,29, xi.15,17, xii.6, xiii.  
 14, xvi.26,29.  
*padḍhati*, c xiv.4.  
*papivā*, xvi.13.  
*payuh*, xvii.8.  
*payasvān*, ix.21.  
*para*, i.8,9,30, iv.18,45,47,  
 50, v.7,10, x.16,25, xiii.  
 16, xiv.4,9,22,29, xvi.19,  
 xxi.5,9; *-para*, iii.1,3,4,  
 iv.4,6,24,28,30,32,33,37,  
 38,42,44,46,52, v.4-6,8,  
 14,17,20,22,23,25,27-30,  
 32,37, vi.5,14, vii.15, viii.  
 2-4,7,11,12,14,16,23,25-  
 31,34, ix.1-5,7,8,10,13,  
 20,22,24, x.2,4-8,13,14,  
 22, xi.9,15,18, xii.4,5, xiii.  
 2-4,11,15, xiv.1,9,11-13,  
 16,17,19-21,23,24,26-8,  
 31, xv.4, xvi.1,2,10,14,27,  
 xix.3, xxi.7,9,11,12,14,16,  
 xxi.15; *para*, xxi.2.  
*paratah*, c v.24, viii.6, x.10,  
 11, xx.3.  
*paratra*, c viii.33.  
*paratva*, c i.15,30.  
*paranipāta*, c ii.2.  
*paranimitta*, c iv.7,25, v.24,  
 viii.6,23, xiv.5, xvi.14v.  
*parabhūta*, c viii.33. xx.4.  
*parama*, xiv.8.  
*paraspara*, c i.3, v.2 (-*rin-*  
*vaya*), xv.6 (dv.).  
*parāmarṣin*, c ii.7.  
*parī*, i.15.  
*parī*, vii.4. viii.28.  
*parī vā*, viii.34.  
*parīkalpand*, c xviii.7v.  
*parigraha* in *ap*-.  
*paribhāshū*, c iv.52.  
*parimāṇa*, xxiii.2: -c i.37.  
*parisamāpti*, c i.61.  
*parihāra*, c intr., i.14,21,53,  
 59, ii.9,20, iii.1, iv.54, v.  
 28, viii.18. ix.8, xiii.14,  
 xvi.13.  
*pari*, iii.7, vii.4.  
*parikshaṇa*, c xiv.5.  
*pariksha*, c i.1.  
*paruh*, viii.32.  
*paryanta*, c i.5,6, iii.9, etc.  
*paryavasāna*, c i.1.  
*paryāya*, c i.47, ii.47, xiv.22,  
 xix.3, xxi.16, xxi.13.  
*pavarga*, ii.39, ix.4: -c ii.  
 44.  
*paṇu*, c i.14 (-*mant*), xxiii.7v.  
*paṇu*, vi.14.  
*pa*, x.13, xvi.2.  
*pākavai*, c xxi.13.  
*pāṭha*, c i.15 (*viśeṣa*-), iii.1,  
 vi.12, vii.16, viii.27. ix.21,  
 x.13, xiii.16,16 (-*antara*).  
 xvi.19,20,26v.29.  
*pāṭhakrama*, c i.1.  
*pāṇi*, xiii.9.  
*pāṇiniyo*, c i.15,53, xiv.4,  
 xviii.1.  
*pāṭhaḥ*, xi.16.  
*pāṭha eṣhaḥ*, xiv.8.  
*pāṭhā*, c i.15.10.  
*pāda*, c xxi.13.  
*pādavṛtta*, xx.6,12: -c xiv.  
 29, xx.8.  
*paḍyubhik*, vi.5.  
*pārayā*, iii.12.  
*pārṣeṣya*, c i.4,14, ii.23,  
 xiv.28.  
*pār*, iii.7, vii.4.  
*pārṣve*, iv.11.  
*pālay*, c ii.17.  
*pāṅgalaksha*, c xxiv.6.  
*pit*, iv.7.  
*pitah*, viii.8.  
*pitārah*, xi.16.  
*pitṛn*, vi.14.  
*pīdhāna*, c xviii.3.  
*pinva*, viii.25.  
*pīplika*, c xxi.13.  
*pībā*, iii.8.  
*pīpivā*, xvi.13.  
*pu*, xvi.9,13.  
*puṇiḥka*, c ii.7.  
*puṇyū*, xiii.9.  
*put*, viii.28.  
*putrah*, xi.16.  
*puṇah*, viii.8 32.  
*punarukta*, i.61: -c i.33 (-*ā*),  
 xi.9 (-*tva*): and *pāunar-*  
*uktya*.  
*punarukti* c xxi.10.

- pluta, i.4,36, x.24, xv.7, xxiv.5: -ci.20, ii.12, iii.1, ix.9, x.15, xv.7 (-vat), 8. pluti in maṇḍūkapa-
- phaṇat, xiii.12.  
phaḷguṇi, iv.12.
- r. badh: +upa, ci.59; +sam, ci.21, xiv.18; +abhisam, c.v.10: and upabandha, prabandha.  
r. badh (bādḥ), ci.61, xvi.19: and bādha etc.  
barsva, ii.18: -ci.19.  
bala, ci.53, ii.18.  
balavant, cxvii.19, xxi.1.  
bahule, iv.11.  
bahuvacana, ci.23, v.24, viii.6.  
bahusvara, iv.40: -c viii.10 (-tva), xvi.12, 18 (-tva).  
bahupādāna, cvi.10, 12, vii.6, 11, viii.10, 29, xi.15, 17, xiii.14, xvi.26.  
Bādābhikāra, see p. 430.  
bāṇa, xiii.9.  
bāṇavān, ix.21.  
bāṇijāya, xiii.12.  
bādha, -dhana, cxvi.19, xxi.5, xxiv.5.  
bādhyā, cxi.5.  
bāhūya, civ.23.  
bibhṛtas ta, iv.52.  
bibhṛtā, iii.10.  
r. budh, ci.53, xiv.28, xix.4, xx.10, xxiii.2, xxiv.2; +ni, xxii.15.  
budhniyā, x.13.  
brhatkapola, cxxiv.6.  
brhadgala, cxxiv.6.  
brhaspati, vi.7.  
bodhaka, cxxi.1.4.  
bodhana, cxvi.29.  
bodhā, iii.8.  
brahma ja-, iv.25.  
brahmaṇ, xiii.13.  
Brahmapurāṇa, cxxiv.6.  
brahmaloka, cxxiv.6.  
brāhmaṇa, ci.61 (-nākye), xiv.33, xxi.1.  
r. brū, xviii.1: -ci.2, 36, 46, iii.1, iv.3 etc., v.22, 37, viii.16, ix.23, x.10, xi.9, xiv.4 etc., xvij.2, xix.3, xxi.1, 13, xxiii.20.  
bhakti, cintr., xxi.6, 15.  
bhāṅga, ci.53, ii.9, iv.52, v.10, 22.  
bhāṅgurā, iii.5.  
r. bhaj, cv.26-30, 38, vii.5-16, viii.24-32, ix.2 etc., x.24, xi.19, xiv.5, xvi.2 etc., xxi.2 etc., 15 (bhajyāmane): and -bhāj etc., vibhajya etc.  
bhājā, iii.8.  
r. bhaṇ, ci.15, 57, xxiv.3v.4, 6.  
bhādrah, xii.3.  
bhaya, cxiv.4.  
bhārātā, iii.11.  
Bharadvāja, see p. 430.  
bharā, iii.12.  
bharishyanti, iv.19.  
bharema, iii.10.  
bhavatah, iv.52.  
bhavatā, iii.12.  
bhavant, ci.21, iv.23.  
bhavā, iii.8.  
Bhavishyapurāṇa, cxxiv.6.  
bhāga, cv.1 (veda-), xiv.28, xix.3 (veda-), xxi.15 (sva-ra-).  
bhāgadhe, iv.11.  
-bhāj, cxiv.18 (nishedha): and kīryabhāj.  
bhājana, cxvii.8.  
bhāmā, cxviii.3.  
bhāmītaḥ, xii.8.  
Bhāradvāja, see p. 430.  
bhāva, v.1, 31, x.17, xv.1, xvii.4, xx.1, 5: -ci.61, ii.12, viii.16, xxiv.5: and abh-  
-bhāvīva, ci.ii.1, x.12.  
r. bhāsh, ci.14, ii.14, 33, viii.19.  
bhāshā in chandobh-  
bhāshya, cintr.  
r. bhās, cintr.  
-bhāhi, viii.14.  
bhinnā, ci.3, 29, iv.11, xiii.15, xxi.18.  
bhīma, bhīmasena, cxviii.3.  
bhūja, xiv.8.  
r. bhū, ii.3, xxi.11, xxi.14: -cv.1; +sam, ci.49, ii.7, iv.23, viii.13, xiii.15: and sambhava.  
-bhūta, ci.ii.2, iv.23, viii.5, etc. etc.  
bhūte, xiv.8.  
bhūyāns, ii.11.  
bhūyānsaḥ, xvi.13.  
bhūshapa, cintr., xvi.19.  
bhūsura, cintr.  
bheda, civ.40, 47, viii.18, 21, xiii.9, xiv.22, 28, xviii.3, xxii.2, xxiii.7, 18, xxiv.4: and abh-  
-bhāyam, viii.14.  
-bhāṅgate, xvi.22.  
ma (m), iv.7, xv.1, xvii.4, xxi.14.  
mah, xii.6.  
maṇṣatā, maṇṣe, xvi.20.  
maṇḥishṭhasya, xvi.28.  
makāra, v.12, 27, 35, viii.4, xiii.1.  
makshhū, iii.14.  
mahgala, ci.1.  
mañca, cvi.9.  
manī, xiii.9.  
mandala, cxxiii.16, 17.  
maṇḍūkapluti, ci.ii.17, iv.51.  
mata, ci.21, 59, ii.2, 19, 27, 47, v.1, 36-41, viii.18, 19, etc. etc.  
mati, xvii.8 (yathām-).  
madhumān, ix.21.  
madhya, ii.6, 41, 45, xix.1: -ci.10, ii.2 (-dega), viii.15 (-stha), xxi.15.  
madhyama, xvii.4, xxi.11, xxi.15, 10: -c xxi.17.  
r. man, ci.15, 18, 19, 21, ii.47, v.2, 31, viii.23, xiii.13, xiv.5, 33, xv.9, xvii.1-8, xix.3, xxi.19; +sam, cv.41, xv.8: and mata etc.  
manah, xxi.6.  
manāḥ, vii.9.  
mantra, ci.ii.9.  
manda, cxxiii.20 (am-).  
mandadhī, ci.13.  
mandra, xxi.11, xxi.15, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16: -c xxi.13.  
manyamānaḥ, xii.8.  
mayānī, vii.12.  
martāḥ, xi.5.  
martyān, ix.21.  
maryādā, ci.1, iv.23.  
r. marṣ: +parā, cxv.3: and parāmargin.  
malimitu, vi.7.  
mahān, ix.21.  
mahāprashṭhya, xi.3.  
Mahābhārata, cxxiv.6.  
Mahābhāshya, ci.ii.7, v.2.  
mahī, vi.2.  
mahī, iv.34.  
mā, x.13, xvi.8; mā pā-tam, iv.42.  
mākiḥ, vi.5.  
Mācākya, see p. 430.  
mātāḥ, viii.8.  
-mātra, xviii.1, xxi.13: -ci.21, 56, 61, ii.13, 19, 25, 33, etc. etc.  
mātrā, xxiv.6.  
mātrika, cxi.15.  
mādhyandina, cxxiii.10.  
Māyikīya, see p. 430.

- lakshya*, ci.22, iv.52, viii.5 (-*va*), xv.9v.  
*laghu*, xxii.14,15, xxiv.5 (-*tā*).  
*r. labh*, ci.11,14,16,21,25, 27,32,34, iii.1, etc. etc., xiv.4; +*upa*, ci.15, xxiii.10,13: and *upalabdhi* etc.  
*r. lamb*: + *ā*, ci.v.11.  
*lāghava*, c.vi.3.  
*lābha*, ci.21.  
*liṅga*, ci.49, ii.7, xiii.9, xv.6.  
*r. lup*, viii.16, ix.1,9, x.14, 19,22, xi.1, xv.1, xvii.4: -c.14,61, v.12-9, viii.17-9, x.14,20-2,23 (*luptavai*), xi.3-18, xii.2-10, xii.2-4.  
*leṇa*, x.23: -c.iv.23, xiv.4.  
*loka*, ci.v.52, xxii.9 (-*vat*).  
*lokān*, vi.14.  
*loke*, iii.6, iv.53.  
*lopa*, i.56,57, v.11, xii.1, xiii.1,15, xv.1, xvii.4, xx.4, xxiv.5: -c.i.51,61, viii.8, 17,18, ix.9, x.19,25, xii.6,8, xxi.14: and *al*.  
*lopin*, i.23: -c.i.24.  
*lūkika*, ci.1.  
*lyap*, cxxi.14.  
  
*va (v)*, iii.4, xii.4.  
*vaḥ*, xi.16.  
*vañgam*, xvi.21.  
*vañsagah*, *vañsate*, xvi.20.  
*vakāra*, ii.43, v.13,30, ix.16, x.15,19,21, xiii.3, xiv.2, 21,26, cx.1,2.  
*vaktra*, ci.37.  
*r. vac*, i.61, xxiii.19: -c.i.7,50, 52,53,59,60, ii.23,24, iv.2, 3,11, viii.10,18, ix.24, xi.2, xii.1, xiii.4,5,8,13, xiv.4,5, etc. etc.; *vivaksh*, ci.37, xiii.15; + *pra*, cxiv.4: and *ukta*, *ukti*, *vdc* etc., *vivakshā*.  
*vacah*, xi.16, xii.6.  
*vacana*, ci.1, ii.7, iii.2,7,8, iv.23,38, v.2, vi.5,13,14, vii.2, viii.8,13, ix.1, x.14, xi.16, xii.11, xiv.5,15,23, 28, xv.8, xvi.29, xix.3.  
*-vat*, i.48,55, ii.21,51.  
*-vat*, iii.3.  
*vatsarasya rūpe*, iv.11.  
*vatsānusārini*, c.xxii.13.  
*vatsānusrti*, c.xxii.13.  
*r. vad*, xxiii.20: -c.i.48, ii.9, iv.52, v.3, xiv.4,23, xvi.13, etc.; + *apa*, cxiv.5: and *apavāda*, -*daka*.  
  
*-van*, iii.3, vii.6.  
*vanaspatiḥkhyah*, xii.8.  
*vapaśrapaṇi*, iv.12.  
*vayunā*, iii.2.  
*r. var*: + *nī*, ci.19, ii.14, iv.40, xi.1, xiii.4, xiv.4, xx.2; + *vi*, c.xxii.14: and *vi-vrta*, *sanivṛta*.  
*Vararuci*, ci.18, ii.14,19, iv.40, viii.19, xviii.7, xxi.15.  
*varga*, i.10,27, ii.51 (-*vat*).  
*varcas*, iv.53.  
*r. varj*, ci.v.52, ix.20, xvi.25.  
*-varja*, c.ix.20.  
*varṇa*, i.1,16,20,56, ii.7, xiii.5, xvii.7,8, xxii.1,2,4, xxiii.1-3: -c.viii.15, xvi.8-10, xx.2, etc.  
*varṇakrama*, xxiv.6.  
*varṇasumhita*, xxiv.2: -c.xiii.14, xxiv.4.  
*varṇāta*, ci.1, xviii.1.  
*r. vart*, ci.47, iii.1,15, iv.5, 23,45,52,54, v.10,19, etc. etc.; + *anu*, ci.36, ii.30, viii.34, x.9; + *nī*, ci.18, 51,59,60, ii.25, ix.9, x.15, 19, xi.1, xiv.5,11, xv.3, xxii.6: + *pra*, c.v.1,3,22, xiv.5: and *anuvartana*, *anuvṛtti*, *āvṛtti*, *nivartaka*, *nivṛtti*.  
*vartamānatva*, c.iii.15.  
*vartayā*, iii.12.  
*vartayāsī*, xvi.18.  
*-vartin*, ci.47, viii.23, ix.18, xxi.3.  
*varḍhayā*, *varḍhā*, iii.8.  
*varshayathā*, iii.10.  
*varshā*, iii.5.  
*varshishthe*, xi.16.  
*vaśān*, ix.21.  
*vasiyā*, xvi.13.  
*vasuḥ*, viii.31.  
*vasū*, iii.7.  
*vastah*, viii.8.  
*vā*, i.24,44,45, ii.50, xviii.7, xix.1, xx.2, xxii.7.  
*vāḥ*, vii.2, viii.8.  
*vāñ eshaḥ*, xi.16.  
*vākya*, ci.61, xxiii.3,3 (-*tā*).  
*vāghā*, vii.13.  
*vdc*, xviii.4, xxiii.3,4: -c.xiv.4,5, xxiii.5-10, xxiv.5.  
*vācuka*, ci.18, v.28, xxi.9, xxii.4.  
*vācayati*, iv.52.  
*-vācin*, ci.15, v.10, xvi.30.  
*vācya*, ci.18, iv.47, xiv.5.  
*vājapeya*, xi.3: -c.i.61.  
*Vājasaneyin*, cxiv.33.  
*vāṇah śata*, xiii.12.  
  
*vāṇijāya*, xiii.12.  
*vāṇiḥ*, xiii.12.  
*vātah*, xi.5.  
*vātā*, iii.5.  
*Vātsagra*, see p. 430.  
*vādu*, c.xiii.9.  
*-vān*, iii.3.  
*vāyu*, ii.2.  
*vāyuh*, iv.42.  
*vāraruca*, c.intr., ii.47, viii.20,22.  
*vāruṇān*, v.21.  
*Vālmiki*, i.28, see p. 430.  
*vācī*, iii.7.  
*vāsasī*, iv.17.  
*vāhanah*, vii.6.  
*vī*, i.15.  
*vī*, iii.15, xvi.25.  
*vikarsha*, xi.3.  
*vikalpa*, ci.19,46, viii.22, ix.1, xiii.16.  
*vikāṇa*, i.28,56, xv.5, xxiv.5: -c.iv.3, v.9, ix.11,12,14, 15, x.8,9.  
*vikārin*, i.23: -c.i.24.  
*vikṛta*, i.51, xvi.3,15: -c.iii.8 (-*va*), xii.15 (do.), xiv.28 (do.): and *av*.  
*vikrama*, xvii.6, xix.1, xxiii.20, xxiv.5: -c.xix.2,5.  
*vikriyā*, c.xii.8.  
*viḡatatva*, c.xiv.28.  
*viḡraha*, cxiv.4.  
*viḡakshaṇa*, xxiv.6: -c.xviii.4.  
*viññeyatva*, c.v.2, xxi.1, xxiv.5.  
  
*r. vid*, xxii.14: -c.i.1 (*vidya-mānutva*), ii.47, ix.24, xiii.14, etc.  
*vidatṛān*, ix.21.  
*viduh*, vi.5.  
*vidmā*, iii.10.  
*vidvā*, xvi.13.  
*vidvān*, vi.14.  
*-vidha*, cxiv.33, xvi.29, xviii.7, xix.3, xxiv.5, etc.  
*vidhāna*, ci.11,15,19,34,53, ii.9,13, iv.7,11, v.2,3,35, x.10,12,15, xii.11, xiv.5, xvi.29, xvii.5, xxi.1, xxiii.7.  
*vidhāyaka*, c.xix.3.  
*vidhi*, v.2: -c.i.14,40,43,61, ii.14,19,23,25,44, iii.8, v.1,41, vii.15, viii.7,15,25 (*yathā*), 28 (do.), ix.3-6, 8,13,17,22,24, x.10,11,13, 24, xi.1, xiii.3, xiv.14,22, xv.8, xvi.3,5,29, xvii.1,3, 4, xix.5, xx.3, xxi.6, xxii.9,10, xxiii.16, xxiv.5.

<i>śikshā</i> , ci.1,2,21, ii.2, xiv.5, 28, xix.3,12, xxi.1,15, xxii.13, xxiii.10,17.	<i>śhu</i> , vii.2.	<i>sanjñā</i> , ci.2-15, 31-9,49, ii.4-6,9, iii.9, iv.3.11,12, 17, xi.3, xv.6, xix.1,5, xx.2, xxii.16.
<i>śikshā</i> , iii.8.	<i>śhū</i> , vii.2.	<i>sanjñāka</i> , ci.13v, xiii.16.
<i>śikshākāra</i> , ci.1, xxi.15.	<i>śhodāca</i> , i.5.	<i>sattvā</i> , vi.12.
<i>śipre</i> , iv.11.	<i>śhṇa</i> , xiii.14.	<i>satya</i> , ci.21,53, ii.18, viii.16, xiii.15.
<i>śiras</i> , ii.3, xxiii.10:-c xx.12 (komala-).	<i>sa</i> (s), iv.7, v.32, viii.23,26, xiii.15.	<i>satyabhānd</i> , cxviii.3.
<i>śive</i> , iv.11.	<i>sa</i> (pron.), v.2, xi.19, xviii.4, xix.1, xx.3.	<i>satrā</i> , iii.5.
<i>r. śish</i> : +vi, ci.30, ii.44, iv.7,34, v.18,19,28, vi.5, x.10, xiv.5,19, xxi.1: and <i>aviśiṣṭa</i> , <i>viśeṣu</i> etc., <i>vāṇiśiṣṭya</i> .	<i>sah</i> , v.15,17, xi.9.	<i>r. sad</i> : + <i>pratyā</i> , cii.42, v.24: and <i>śanna</i> .
<i>śiṣṭa</i> , ci.1.	<i>sañyukta</i> , xxii.15:-c xxi.5 (as-).	<i>sadane</i> , iv.11.
<i>śikā</i> , iii.2.	<i>sañyuta</i> , ci.54 (as-).	<i>sadṛṣa</i> , xi.19:-c v.28, xxiv.6.
<i>śirshaṇ</i> , xiii.13.	<i>sañyoga</i> , xxi.4 (-gādī), 15, xxii.14,15, xxiv.3:-c xvii.4.	<i>sadohāvīr dhāne</i> , iv.11.
<i>śukla</i> , c v.28.	<i>sanirakṣaṇa</i> , cv.15.	<i>sadbhāva</i> , cxiii.14, xiv.28, xvi.29.
<i>śuddhā</i> , iii.2.	<i>sanivṛta</i> , ii.4,27:-c xxi.15, xxii.9 (-tā).	<i>sadhik</i> , vi.5.
<i>śuśruvā</i> , xvi.13.	<i>sanivyavahāra</i> , ci.14. xxii.3.	<i>sani</i> , <i>sanik</i> , <i>sanik</i> , vi.12.
<i>śushmā</i> , xi.16.	<i>sañṣita</i> , <i>sañṣitā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sanutah</i> , viii.8.
<i>śūnya</i> , cxx.2.	<i>sañṣeṣha</i> , cii.33.	<i>sañtānebhyaḥ</i> , vi.12.
<i>śṛṅge</i> , iv.11.	<i>sañṣvā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sañdeha</i> , i.25:-ci.14,26, iv.23, v.1, xxi.2,5.
<i>śṛṇvā</i> , iii.10.	<i>samsad</i> , xxiv.6.	<i>sañdhāna</i> , ii.2, xxiv.3:-c xiv.15.
<i>śeṣa</i> , i.6,14,42,46, ii.28, xxii.14:-ci.44-5, ii.29,47, xiii.15, xxi.15.	<i>sañsadaḥ</i> , xvi.26v.	<i>sañdhā</i> , cii.18, x.15,24,25, xxi.1.
<i>śeshabhūta</i> , cii.47, iv.3, xi.3.	<i>samsarga</i> , xxiii.2.	<i>sañdhya</i> , ci.33, ii.47, 48, xviii.1.
<i>Śātyāyana</i> , see p. 430.	<i>sañsṛṣṭā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sañnadāh</i> , xii.3.
<i>śo</i> , xvi.2.	<i>sañskṛta</i> , <i>sañskṛtya</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sañnikarsha</i> , cxxiv.3.
<i>śoṇā</i> , xiii.12.	<i>sañsphānaḥ</i> , xi.16.	<i>sañnipāta</i> , x.12.
<i>śyēti</i> , x.18.	<i>sañsṛā</i> , xvi.26.	<i>sapūrva</i> , v.19, viii.22.
<i>śyenāya</i> , xi.3.	<i>sañhiti</i> , v.1, xv.8, xxi.10, xxiv.1-4:-ci.60,60 (as-), iii.1,8, v.3, vii.10, ix.22, 24, x.10,12, xi.9, xiii.5,14, xiv.29, xv.7, xvi.29, xix.3, xx.2: and <i>sañhita</i> .	<i>sapta</i> , xxiii.4,11.
<i>śṛapayān</i> , ix.23.	<i>sak</i> , vi.12.	<i>saptami</i> , cv.10, xvi.25.
<i>śṛavāṇa</i> , civ.35.	<i>sakala</i> , civ.52, xvi.29 (-pa-da).	<i>saptābhik</i> , vi.12.
<i>śrī</i> , vii.9.	<i>sakāya</i> , xvi.10.	<i>sapte</i> , vi.5.
<i>r. śru</i> , cxvii.6.	<i>sakāra</i> , v.6,10,14, vi.1,14, xvii.1:-ci.44.	<i>sabhayaḥ</i> , vi.12.
<i>śruti</i> , iv.35, xii.7, xiii.12:-c xxi.15.	<i>sañiketa</i> , ci.21.	<i>sam</i> , v.6, xiii.4; <i>sam in-dra</i> , vii.2.
<i>śrudhī</i> , iii.13.	<i>sañikshepa</i> , cxii.6.	<i>sama</i> , i.42,45,46, xvii.2, xxiii.19.
<i>śreyā</i> , xvi.13.	<i>sañikhyā</i> , xvi.25:-ci.1,11, ii.19, x.15,22, xxiii.16.	<i>samabhivyaḥāra</i> , cxiii.14.
<i>śroni</i> , iii.7.	<i>sañikhyāna</i> , i.48 (as-):-ci.59.	<i>samaya</i> , ciii.1, iv.5, vi.14, xiii.17.
<i>r. ślish</i> : + <i>sam</i> , cii.12, xvii.4: and <i>upaśleṣha</i> , <i>duḥśliṣṭa</i> , <i>praśliṣṭa</i> , <i>sañ-ṣleṣha</i> .	<i>sañghāta</i> , cxvii.3.	<i>samarthana</i> , cxiii.14.
<i>śloka</i> , cxxii.14, xxiii.20.	<i>sacāsvā</i> , iii.8.	<i>samarthanaya</i> , cxvi.19.
<i>śvā</i> , iii.2.	<i>r. saj</i> : + <i>pra</i> , cii.9,20, iii.1, xix.3; <i>prasakta</i> , ci.4, ii.29, v.3,37, ix.13, xiv.5, xxi.1: and <i>ap-</i> , <i>prasakti</i> , <i>prasakta</i> .	<i>samarthay</i> , cv.3, xiii.4v, xiv.4.
<i>śvāsa</i> , ii.5,10, xxiv.5:-c ii.3.	<i>sajātiya</i> , cx.1.	<i>samāna</i> , cii.23,47,48, iv.23, v.27, viii.19,21, ix.8, xxi.6,15.
<i>sha</i> (śh), vii.13, viii.23,33, xiii.6.	<i>sajūh</i> , iv.25.	<i>samānakāla</i> , i.33.
<i>śhaḥ</i> , vii.11.	<i>sañjñaka</i> , ci.15.	<i>samānapada</i> , iv.54, xiii.6, xxii.13:-c xiii.15,16.
<i>śhakāra</i> , v.10,32, vi.1:-c ii.44.		<i>samānakshara</i> , i.2, x.2, xv.6:-ci.3,4, x.10, xv.9.
<i>śhat</i> , vii.2.		<i>samānān</i> , ix.23.
<i>śhaṇṇ</i> , xiii.14.		<i>samāmnāya</i> , i.1:-ci.2,5, ii.1.
<i>śhatva</i> , ci.51,60, v.3, vi.4,5, 13, vii.2, viii.16,35.		<i>samāsa</i> , cii.2, iii.9, v.1, x.6, xiii.9.
<i>śhash</i> , i.9.		
<i>śhashtha</i> , iv.52.		
<i>-shi</i> , xvi.14.		

<i>sparṣa</i> , i.7, 10, ii.44, v.27, 34, xiii.15, xiv.2.3.9, 27, xxi.9, 12.	11. xiv.29, 31, xviii.2, 5, xix.1, xxi.10, 11, xxiv.5: -c x.10, xvii.6, xix.3, xx.1, xxiii.15, 17, 17 (- <i>tva</i> ).	+ <i>vyā</i> . cxxiv.4v; + <i>pari</i> , ci.59, iii.1; + <i>upasam</i> , cii.18.32: -c ii.22, 23: and <i>udāharaṇa</i> , <i>parihāra</i> , <i>upa-samihṛta</i> , - <i>hāra</i> , <i>samāhāra</i> .
<i>sparṣaṇa</i> , ii.33: and <i>as-spaṣaḥ</i> , vi.12.	<i>svarūpa</i> , ci.21, 40, v.2, xvi.30, xxi.10, 15, xxiv.4.6.	<i>harā</i> , iii.12.
<i>spashta</i> , c xvii.8 ( <i>atis</i> -, <i>as</i> -): and <i>vis</i> -. <i>spashtīkar</i> , c xiii.15v.	<i>svā</i> , iii.5.	<i>harinī</i> , c xxi.15.
<i>sphaṭīkar</i> , c ix.8, xiii.15.	<i>svādhyāya</i> , c xviii.1.	<i>haritā</i> (or <i>hār</i> -), c xxi.15.
<i>sphuranti</i> , vi.13.	<i>svānāso divi</i> , vi.2.	<i>harī</i> , iv.15.
<i>sphuritatva</i> , c ii.25.	<i>svāyoga</i> , c ii.25.	<i>hal</i> , c ix.24.
<i>syah</i> , v.15.	<i>svāra</i> , xvii.6, xx.8, xxiii.20: -c xxiii.17.	<i>havan</i> , vii.11.
<i>sra</i> , xvi.2.	<i>svārtha</i> , c ii.17.	<i>haviṣmān</i> , ix.21.
<i>srādi</i> , i.60, xv.4: -c xvii.5.	<i>svādhāṛṭi</i> , iii.7.	<i>hastavinyāsa</i> , c xxiii.17.
<i>srīdhāh</i> , xii.8.	<i>svīkar</i> , ci.19.21, 25, iv.23, 52, xi.3, xii.14.	<i>dhā</i> , viii.8.
<i>sua</i> , xxiv.4 ( <i>yathā</i> -): -c xiv.28.	<i>svikāra</i> , civ.23, x.12, xiv.5.	<i>hīritā</i> (or <i>har</i> -), c xxi.15.
<i>svataḥ</i> , c ii.23, xxi.7.	<i>svendā</i> , iii.10.	<i>Hārta</i> , see p. 430.
<i>svatantra</i> , c xxi.6.	<i>ha</i> ( <i>h</i> ), ii.9, iv.7, xii.4, xiv.26.	<i>hi</i> , iv.37, 44, vi.2, xvi.13; <i>hi payasvān</i> , ix.21; <i>hi śtthā</i> , iii.8.
<i>svadeṣa</i> , ci.59.	<i>ha</i> , xvi.2.	<i>hiṇuyāt</i> , <i>hiṇoti</i> , xiii.12.
<i>svādhdvāh</i> , xii.8.	<i>hānsapadā</i> (or - <i>pidā</i> ), c xxi.15.	<i>hīraṇmayam</i> , xiii.8.
<i>svabhāva</i> , c xiii.14 (- <i>tva</i> ), xiv.28.	<i>hakāra</i> , i.13, ii.6, 9, 46, 47, v.38, xiv.19, xvi.27, xxi.14: -c ii.3, 7, 44.	<i>hīraṇyavarṇīya</i> , ix.20, xi.3.
<i>svayampātha</i> , c ix.21.	<i>han</i> : in <i>nihata</i> .	<i>hātāmān</i> , ix.21.
<i>r. svar</i> , xx.2, 3: -c i.41: and <i>atīsvārya</i> .	<i>han</i> , vii.11.	<i>hṛd</i> , c xxiii.17.
<i>svara</i> , i.5.33, ii.8.31, 47, viii.3, ix.10, xi.18, xii.4, xiii.16, xiv.1, 16, xv.1, xvi.2, xvii.5, xxi.1.2, xxiii.14, xxiv.6: -c xvii.3, xxii.12, xxiii.7, 11, 15-7 etc etc.	<i>hanu</i> , ii.12 ( <i>oṣṭhga</i> -), 16: -c xxiii.2.	<i>hṛdayā</i> , iii.2.
<i>svara</i> , vi.13.	<i>hanū</i> , iii.7.	<i>hetayaḥ</i> , xii.8.
<i>svarabhakti</i> , ii.19, xxi.6.15: -c i.1.6, ii.33, xxi.16.	<i>hanūmūla</i> , ii.35: -c ii.17.	<i>hotāḥ</i> , viii.8.
<i>svarasa</i> , c v.22.	<i>hantunā</i> , iii.10.	<i>hrasvā</i> , i.3, 20, 31, 41, iii.1, ix.18, xvi.16, xxii.15, xxiv.5.
<i>svarāṅga</i> , xxi.1.	<i>hanyat</i> , vii.3.	<i>hrasvatva</i> , ci.52.
<i>svarita</i> , i.40, x.12, 16, xii.9.	<i>r. har</i> , xvii.8; + <i>udā</i> , xxii.3: -c xii.3 xiii.13, xvi.12, xxiii.4, 17; + <i>samā</i> , ci.40;	<i>hrasvārtha</i> , i.37: -c i.42, 44, 46, xvii.5.
		<i>hrādūni</i> , iii.7.
		<i>hvdh</i> , viii.8.



- Dental mutes (*t, th, d, dh, n*), how formed, ii.38: see also the several letters.
- dh*, dental mute, ii.38.
- dh*, lingual mute, ii.37.
- Diphthongs (*e, ai, o, au*): see the several letters.
- Duplication, of *ñ, n*, final, ix.18-9; of *ch, kh, bh*, xiv.8; of aspirate mutes in the MSS., p. 290,294; duplication in consonant groups, xiv.1-7,9-28.
- e*, how uttered, ii.15-7,23; combination with preceding *a, ā*, x.6; with following vowel, ix.11,13, x.19; initial *a* elided after, xi.1 etc.; resulting accent, xii.9-11; final *a* elided before, x.14; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Elision, see Omission.
- Euphonic alteration, concerns single element only, i.56; of a cited word, does not suspend rules, i.51; mode of intimating in rules, i.23,28.
- Final consonant, belongs to preceding vowel, xxi.3; makes heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- g*, guttural mute, ii.35.
- gh*, guttural mute, ii.35.
- Grammarians quoted by name in the rules and comment, p. 430.
- Grave accent (*anudatta*), defined, i.39; how produced, xxi.10; grave syllable, when converted to enclitic circumflex, xiv.29-31; when uttered at acute pitch, xxi.10-1.
- Groups of consonants, occurring in Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, detail of their division in syllabication, p. 380-2,385: make a heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- Guttural mutes (*k, kh, g, gh, ṅ*), how formed, ii.35: see also the several letters.
- h*, a spirant, i.9; not surd, i.13; intermediate between surd and sonant, ii.6; inheres in sonant aspirates, ii.9; uttered in the throat, ii.46; has same position as following vowel, ii.47; combination with preceding final mute, v.38-41; before a nasal, *ndistīya* inserted after, xxi.14.
- h*, see *visarjaniya*.
- Heavy syllable, xxi.14.
- i, ī*: how formed, ii.22; combination with preceding *a, ā*, x.4; with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:—*i*, final, result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,13; *pragraha* ending, iv.8-54.
- Increment, how intimated, i.23.
- Insertions, of *ç, s, d*, anomalous, v.4-8; of *k, t*, v.32,33; after spirant before mute, xiv.9.
- j*, palatal mute, ii.36; *t* before, to *j*, v.23; *n* before, to *ñ*, v.24.
- iatā*-text, p. 429-30.
- jh*, palatal mute, ii.36; not found in the Saṁhitā, p. 72.
- jihvāmūliya* (*χ*), guttural spirant, i.9, ii.41-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.
- k*, guttural mute, ii.35; inserted after *ñ* before *s, sh*, v.32; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.
- kampa*, peculiar affection of a circumflex followed by another circumflex, xix.3-5; differences between the Tāittirīya and other texts as to its occurrence and treatment, p. 362-3.
- kandikās*, division of *anuvākas* into, not recognized by the Prāticākhya, p. 5,83, 427,430.
- Kārttikeya, asserted author of the Prāticākhya, p. 1.
- kh*, guttural mute, ii.35; *h* to *s* or *sh* before, viii.23 etc.; doubled in certain words, xiv.8.
- krama*-text, p. 429.
- kshātipra* circumflex, xx.1; its occurrence, x.16; its tone, xx.9.
- l*, semivowel, i.8; how produced, ii.42; assimilates preceding *t, m, n*, v.25,26, 28; resulting nasal *l*, v.26,28; changed to *d*, xiii.16; duplication after, xiv.2,3, 7.
- ḷ*, not a simple vowel, p. 11; of short quantity, i.31; how produced, ii.18.
- Labial mutes (*p, ph, b, bh, m*), how formed, ii.39: see also the several letters.
- Light syllable, xxi.15.
- Lingual mutes (*t, th, d, dh, n*), how formed, ii.37: see also the several letters.
- Long vowel, i.35: and see Prolongation.
- m*, labial mute, ii.39; assimilated to following mute, v.27; and semivowel (except *r*), v.28-31, xiii.3; irregularly dropped, v.12; to *ñ* before *r* or spirant, v.29, xiii.2; unchanged before *rā*, xiii.4.
- Manuscripts of Prāticākhya and commentary: see Tāittirīya-Prāticākhya.
- Mutes, i.7; division and names, i.10,11; what mutes are surd, i.12; mode of formation of the various series, ii.35-9; their designation, i.27: see also the several series and letters.

- conversion to *sh*, v.10, vi.1-13; inserted after *n* before *t*, vi.14; insertions of *k* and *t* before, v.3-32; *s* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35.
- Schools of Vedic study cited by name, p. 427.
- Semivowels (*y*, *r*, *l*, *v*), i.8; their effect on division of syllables, xxi.7: and see the several letters.
- sh*, lingual spirant, i.9, ii.44; conversion of *s* to, v.10, vi.1-13; insertions of *k* and *t* before, v.32-3; changes following *t*, *th*, to *ṭ*, *ṭh*, vii.13-4; *n* to *ṇ*, xiii.6 etc.; *sh* from *h* before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35.
- Short vowels, i.31-3.
- Sibilants (*ç*, *sh*, *s*), see the several letters, and Spirants.
- Similar vowels, i.3.4.
- Sonant utterance, ii.4; sonant consonants, i.14.
- Spirants (*ç*, *çh*, *s*, *ç*, *h*), i.9; quality as regards sonancy, i.12-3; require more breath, ii.11; mode of articulation, ii.44-5; *h* converted into, ix.2-6; insertion after, before mute, xiv.9-11; aspiration of a surd mute before, xiv.12-3; effect of, on division of syllables, xxi.9; see also the several letters.
- Surd mute, converted to sonant before sonant, viii.3; to nasal before nasal, viii.2.4.
- Surd utterance, ii.5,10; surd consonants, i.12.
- svarabhakti*, how uttered, ii.19; occurrence, xxi.15-6; belongs to what syllable, xxi.6; various kinds of, p. 392-3.
- svarita*, see Circumflex.
- Syllabication, xxi.1-14.
- Syllables, heavy and light, xxii.14-5.
- t*, dental mute, ii.38; changed to *c* or *j* before palatals, v.22,23; to *l* before *l*, v.25; *n* becomes *ṇs* before, vi.14; inserted after *t*, *n*, before *s*, *sh*, v.33; changed to *ṭ* after *sh*, vii.13.
- t*, lingual mute, ii.37; adds *t* before *s*, *sh*, v.33; *t* changed to, after *sh*, vii.13.
- tāirovyañjana* enclitic circumflex, xx.7; its tone, xx.12.
- Tāittirīya-Āraṇyaka, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p. 425-6.
- Tāittirīya-Brahmaṇa, phrases quoted from, in commentary, p. 425-6.
- Tāittirīya-Prāṭicākhyā, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; various readings in its text, see Additions and Corrections, p. 467; its commentary, see Tribhāshyaratna; right to its name, p. 427; relation of the text it implies to the known Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, p. 424-8; grammarians quoted by it, p. 430; classification of their quoted doctrines, p. 430-2; presumable alterations in it, p. 432; its character, p. 432-3.
- Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā, relation of, to the text assumed in the Prāṭicākhyā, p. 424-7; its divisions, p. 430; names of different parts of, p. 430.
- Text, four kinds of, xxiv.1-4; various forms of, assumed by the Prāṭicākhyā, p. 428-30.
- th*, dental mute, ii.38; changed to *ṭh* after *sh*, vii.14.
- ṭh*, lingual mute, ii.37; *ṭh* changed to, after *sh*, vii.14.
- Tones (*yama*), the twenty-one, xxii.12, xxiii.11 etc.; tone of *om*, xviii.4.
- Tribhāshyaratna, manuscripts of, p. 1-3; different versions, p. 3; its sources, and meaning of its name, p. 6-7; works quoted in it, p. 435; its relation to and treatment of the Prāṭicākhyā, 433-4; quotation of phrases not found in the Saṁhitā, 424-6.
- u*, *ū*: how formed, ii.24-5; combination with preceding *a*, *i*, x.5:—combination of *u* with following vowel, x.15; resulting circumflex, x.16:—*ū*, *pragraha* as final, iv.5; result of irregular prolongation, iii.7,14; occurrence of *pralishṭa* circumflex in, x.17.
- u*, particle, combination of, ix.16-7; finals combined with, p. 102-4.
- udatta*, see Acute.
- Uncombinable final vowels, x.13,18,24,25.
- upadhmanīya* (*ṭ*), labial spirant, i.9, ii.44-5; its designation, i.18; occurrence, ix.2-4.
- Upāṅgas, enumerated, p. 422.
- v*, semivowel, i.8; how uttered, ii.43; irregular omission of, as initial, v.13; final, dropped, x.19-23; nasal *v* from *m*, v.28,30; duplication after, xiv.2; resolution of usual *v* into *uv*, p. 64.
- Vājasaneyi-Brahmaṇa, referred to in commentary, p. 317.
- varṇakrama*, see Duplication.
- Veda, rewards promised for studying or teaching, p. 420-1; see also Yajurveda.
- Tāittirīya-Saṁhitā.
- Vedāṅgas, enumerated, p. 422.
- vikrama* accent, xix.1,2; its tone, xvii.6.
- visarjunya* (*h*), not a spirant, p. 14; how uttered, ii.46,48; is surd, i.12; its designation, i.18; authorized in *saṁhitā* only before pause and *ksh*, ix.3; becomes spirant before surd, ix.2; dropped before spirant followed by surd, ix.1; to *s* or *sh*, before *k*, *kh*, *p*, viii.23-35; to *sh* before *t*, vi.5; omitted in *sah* etc., v.15-7; to *r* (except before *r*), viii.

## ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

PART of these emendations are due to Prof. Weber, who has called my attention to them in private communications. A few slight misprints, of obvious character, are not noted here.

p. 2, l. 25. The MS. used by Weber was another (No. 504) in the same collection, containing only the text (incomplete) of the Prāticākhya.

p. 3, l. 1. Dr. Rosi's description of these MSS. has not yet appeared. It appears, however, that the rules of the Prāticākhya are read interspersed in the commentary also, as well as prefixed to it in a body (with separate paging).

p. 3, l. 4. The differences of reading in the Prāticākhya text itself are more numerous than is here stated. They have been pointed out in the course of the work (either in the notes on the rules, or in the various readings to the comment)—namely, as occurring (with here and there an addition, omitted in its proper place) in i.61, ii.17,51, iv.11,39 (T. W. *ahne*, for *'hne*), v.13,20 (G. M. *ṣakāraṣ*, for *-raṁ*: a mere blunder), vii.8 (G. M. *yajush*, for *yajuh*), 12, viii.8 (T., it should be added, has dropped both *sanuta* and *stanuta*), 13,35, ix.21,22, x.11;(T. W. B. O. *amundāsikam*, for *'nun-*), 13 (G. M. *-pā asiparo budhniyā jyā ā pūshā aminanta ārahe*, which is perhaps the more acceptable reading, since it gives the uncombinable finals their uncombinable quality in the rule also), 22, xi.16 (G. M. *adabdhāsa* and *ashādhaḥ*, with unelided *a*), 17 (G. M. *ahnīyā mā 'mbālā*), 18,19 (G. M. repeat the whole rule, instead of its last two words only), xii.4,9 (T. O. *asmin*, for *tas-*), xiii.4,13,14 (see farther on), 15, xiv.3,8 (G. M. *upasargaṣ ca pātha*: a blunder only), 13,32, xvi.1,5 (G. M. *ṣaṣṭān anant-*: a blunder), 7,13 (G. M. omit *pipivā* in the rule, as well as its example in the comment; but they give the word in the rehearsal at the beginning of the comment), 16,19,22,26, xvii.2,4, xviii.5 (T. *svaritaṣ ca pt-*), xx.9 (G. M. substitute in the text-MS. rule xvii.6, except the word *pāushkarasādeḥ*), xxi.5,6,14, xxii.7 (W. O. also have *-shakaḥ* in the rule, but not in the comment), xxiii.2,6,10,12,14,20, xxiv.4. The reading adopted for rule xiii.14 is that of T. G. M. (save that T. has *shtha* for *shna*, and *rāvna*, with *virāma* under the *v*; and G. M. have *rāvinna* in the text-MSS., and *rāvāvinna* in the MSS. with comment); W. gives *ṛṇṇ shan shā nina rāva* (with *virāma* under both *v* and *n*); for (1. the collator has noted nothing; B. reads *ṛṇ shan shna mpa rāva grāva*). Other evident copyists' errors occur, of too little account to be worth notice.

A reading has been adopted contrary to the authority of all the MSS. at ix.1,20 (where the MSS.-reading is *ikāraukārap-*), xi.1,17. The writing of *iṅgya* for *iṅgya* was noted under i.48.

p. 9, l. 16. The commentator, as will be seen under xxi.14, interprets out of existence the *nāsikya* as an independent element.

p. 11, l. 7. The structure of *r* is defined by the commentator under xxi.15.

p. 18, l. 12. The commentator refers to some "different reading" (perhaps in his *Ṣikshā*? there is no trace of it in the Prāticākhya), beginning *pra parā 'pa sam*, but declares it to have to do only with the addition to all these words of *iti* (in the *pada*-text, namely, which writes *e 'ti* for *ā*, *ape 'ti* for *apa*, and so on) and not to their receiving the name *upasarga*. I still fail to see any reason for the limitation of the class to half its usual number.

p. 23, l. 13. Dele the hyphen at the end of the line.

p. 33, l. 16. One may conjecture that rule 43 formerly concluded the treatment of accent in this chapter, and applied to all the three kinds of accent; but, rules 44-7, on the circumflex, being later interpolated, the connection made it necessary to understand this also as applying to the circumflex alone.

p. 34, rule 46. The same example (from iii.3.111) is quoted by the comment under this rule as under rules 43 and 47.

p. 37, l. 19. Compare under rules xvi.26,29, where this claim is distinctly made. But it is not entirely well founded, for there are cases where combinations of sounds which are *padas* are quoted as *padāikadeṣas*: thus *han* in vii.11, *pā* in xvi.2, *hi* in xvi.13, etc.

p. 232, l. 26. I have noted here all the cases in which the *saṁhitā*-text shows *dhā, mā, or pā* before *asi*; it appears, however, from Weber's edition of the *Sanhitā*, that a part of them have *h* in *pada*-text after the *a*.

p. 233, l. 11 from below. Read (in part of the edition) *prape 've* (for *-pā*).

p. 239, l. 6. Read *o* for *a*.

p. 265, l. 5. The combination *ūrdhvo aśhāt* is in fact read first at iv.2.14, in an *ukhya*-passage.

p. 265, l. 10. There is, however, a case in which *a* is omitted according to the general rules, when by the letter, though not the spirit, of i.61 it ought to be retained; see under i.61 (p. 47).

p. 273, rule 12. I should doubtless have done better to adopt the reading *vāpi-jāya* (for *bān*), in rule, version, and example.

p. 291, l. 24. *Achāvākah* is found at vii.1.55.

p. 296, l. 9. Read *hlesh* (by ix.3); and this would change the treatment of the group, since *h* (i.9) is not a spirant.

p. 301, l. 3. Read *hlesh, hlesh* (by ix.3); so that *jihvāmūliya* occurs only in the four remaining groups.

p. 302, l. 23. I can give no reference for *varshābhyah*, the reading at vii.4.13 being *varshyābhyah svāhā 'varshyābhyah*.

p. 303, l. 9. I was heedless enough here to overlook the fact that a spirant never stands, according to the rules of this chapter, before either an aspirated surd or a nasal, since a first mute (by rule 9, above) is always inserted in such cases between the two. The groups *sch* etc., therefore, would be read according to this rule *schch*, instead of *schh*. The groups in which a nasal originally follows the spirant will be found catalogued under rule xxi.12 (p. 390). The example *tasmād* etc., below, is therefore no counter-example, and it is G. M. that are in the wrong in so calling it; it is to be read *taspmāt*, according to Plākshi etc., instead of *tasspmāt* (or, with *yama*, *tasspypmāt*).

p. 304, l. 5. See also under xxi.16.

p. 308, l. 6 from below. Read *dhakāre* for *-ra*.

p. 315, l. 10. Prof. Hadley's paper may be found printed in full in the Transactions of the American Philological Association (vol. i., 1871, p. 1 ff.).

p. 334, l. 7. Read vii.5.152 (for vii.5.142).

p. 336, l. 7. "Verbal forms"—that is, of course, all excepting *rjishi*.

p. 354, ll. 17, 25. See p. 426. Prof. Roth's MS. also ends with *samudrah*; he calls my attention, further, to the passage in the *Bṛhad-Āraṇyaka* (i.1.2). *samudra eva 'sya* [i. e. *apvasya*] *bandhuh samudro yonih*.

p. 356, l. 3. For *dhṛta* as synonym of *pracaya*, see below, under xiii.17 (p. 412).

p. 364, l. 24. And accordant, it may be added, with the practice followed in the *Vājasaneyi-Sanhitā*, where there is no added figure, and no prolongation of the vowel.

p. 369, marg. notes, l. 6. The *anudatta*-mark under *su* (the second time) has fallen out.

p. 373, l. 1. Read i.2.51 (for i.2.52).

p. 386, l. 18. The *e* sign has broken off in the *saṁhitā*-reading of *agne*.

p. 387, l. 7. I have considered this point more fully in a paper on the Sanskrit accent in the Transactions of the Am. Philological Association (vol. i., 1871, p. 20 ff.).

p. 414, l. 4. Read (in *Devanāgarī*) *kramavik*, for *kramivak* (altered in the type, by some mishap, after the last correction).

p. 425, l. 29-30. *Achāvākah* is found at vii.1.55.

p. 428, l. 37. But see, for the commentary, the additional note above to i.15 (or p. 18).

p. 429, l. 26. The *krama*-text is also quoted under ix.24 (p. 224) by O. alone.

n. 438. last line but one. Read *xxi*. for *xxvi*.

